



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_35289
Title of the Manuscript:	DUMPSITE CHARACTERISATION IN EKPOMA FROM INTEGRATED SURFACE GEOPHYSICAL METHODS
Type of the Article	Review paper

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Lines 26 – 27 “The resulting leachate...are not affected” (Provide reference)</p> <p>Lines 28 – 30 have claim that needs proof: “...without effective safety and control measures” (Provide reference).</p> <p>Lines 37 – 41 have many unfounded assertions without either statistical evidences or references. Please provide proofs.</p> <p>Lines 47 – 50 need references Lines 61 – 73 need references</p> <p>Lines 165 and 172: separate the Fig. caption from the write-up. Do same in other places they occurred.</p> <p>In your materials and method, you only gave the description of the instrument used. What of the 4 VES stations you mentioned?</p> <p>In your conclusion, you mentioned functional and abandoned dumpsites. Which of the four stations are grouped as functional and abandoned? Could you describe them in the methodology?</p>	<p>It doesn't need reference, because with the help of physics of flow and the theory behind leachate migration.</p> <p>This claim was put forward because of the preliminary investigation done in the area by us. Also, this is where I have lived for the past 27 years.</p> <p>Lines 47- 50, it has been referenced now. Lines 61- 73, are due to geological investigation carried out in the studied area. Hence plate 2 has been included. Also GPS was used to take the elevations of the area studied.</p> <p>Materials and methods including conclusion have been revised accordingly.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 60: Change the referencing to [4; 5] Line 132: [6; 13; 14] Also use this format for the others</p>	Corrected.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The methodology, in terms of study location and distribution should be revised. The result needs revision, especially in the case of “functional and abandoned dumpsites”</p>	These have been revised accordingly.