

Peer Reviewer Comments and MECL Response of Akapur Block

Sl.No.	Peer Reviewer Comments	MECL Response
1	Please check the number of primary core samples analyzed and external check samples mentioned in executive summary and in text of chapter- 12.	Corrections made in Chapter-12
2	The target set for chemical analysis under chapter 'laboratory studies' is 300 but achievement is only 167. The reasons for shortfall may clearly specified.	Considering uniformity of limestone and dolomite. 2m sample length considered. Hence, sample nos are reduced and accordingly primary samples are also reduced
3	In Text Figure- 3 on page 19, dip amounts are not legible. This is to enable the proper interpretation of structural features like faults. The facies variation and relationship between limestone and dolomite may clearly be elaborated. In chapter 7.3.1.	The deposit is bedded, Limestone is lensoidal body within the dolomite
4	In text figure -1 directions of landmark feature like railway station/district headquarters may be shown by arrows if locations fall outside of your text drawing. There is discrepancy in text on the direction of railway station in relation to target exploration area. In one place it is shown as north and in other place as south east. May be rectified.	Rectified in the Text Figure-1
5	As per standard stratigraphic nomenclature it should be written as Putnur-Mangurda Formation, not formation.	Attended
6	Description on Regional Geology is too lengthy and un contextual	Modified
7	Dates of commencement of drilling in table 13,1 may be verified. Somehow it looks glaring as if you have used two rigs for coring rigs on day-night shift basis.	Verified the date of commencement of drilling, it is correct
8	Please see table no. 13.3. Is it ASTM or different ?. Under column RQD % the values are different from 90% claimed elsewhere in page no.43. in the report.	It is ASTM classification
9	The report derives its strength/weightage from the chemical analysis carried out in MEC laboratory. It is only XRF method. Attempt may be made to please check it with the analytical values by wet method. Even in the analysis tables the outcome of blind samples and their results ,variation if at all, are not documented. There is no confirmation by duplicate or check samples in another accredited laboratory.	Total 17 no. of samples were analysed for check analysis at JNARDDC, Nagpur. The check analysis are placed in Annexure-III B

Sl.No.	Peer Reviewer Comments	MECL Response
10	Geological model of the deposit should be clearly documented. Lensoid ? Pinching or swelling ? inter-toging, discontinuous type. Auto CAD modelling and its drawing is preferred even for resource estimation.	The deposit is bedded, Limestone is lensoidal body within the dolomite
11	Attempt may be made to improve the clarity of the report by avoiding undue repetition and in-consistencies therein . Minor corrections /suggestions on the hardcopy of the report need to be followed.	Attended