



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_37120
Title of the Manuscript:	A GEOPHYSICAL INVESTIGATION OF A SOLID WASTE LANDFILL USING VERTICAL ELECTRICAL SOUNDING METHOD IN ALUU COMMUNITY, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The abstract more focusing on the results and discussion. Please improve the abstract by including the methodology at this part. 2) Please follow the correct format of writing paper 3) Too much citation from introduction part, however the author should relate his/her finding with the previous researchers in discussion part. 4) Please rewrite the references according to the correct format. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This abstract has been improved upon slightly. However, the abstract captures the methodology. 2) The work followed the format of writing paper as much as possible. 3) Part of the introduction has been moved to discussion part and used to justify the correctness of the results obtained in this work. See last part of Results and discussion section. 4) The references have been corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please include reference for Figure 4. 2) The conclusion is not concrete, please highlight the outcome related with the objective from this research 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The reference has been included. 2) I don't agree with the reviewer on this. The conclusion clearly captures the objective for this study. You may please check the conclusion and relate to lines 50-83.
Optional/General comments	OK.	