



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_46005
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF HRU AND IMPACT OF FLOOD RISK IN TERENGGANU SUB-BASINS RIVER CATCHMENT AREA
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lines 72 and 116: wet tropical equatorial climate..... – at the specific latitudes at which the drainage basin under consideration is located, there can be only equatorial, not tropical and equatorial. The best term is: monsoonal inter-tropical climate, according to universal climatic classifications. Please note on Fig 1: all neighbouring elements, the names of the main river tributaries, the names of the main river and tributaries, the names or order numbers of monitoring stations; Study Flow: for more clarity, please specify what exact sub-basin parameters were calculated. The elements on Fig 2 and 3 could very well be integrated in Fig. 1. Flood Risk Model of.....: please give a clear account on what criteria the five flood risk categories were established and specify their ranging values. Please provide a more accurate insight on the specific parameters that were used to classify the component sub-basins and give extra comments on the HRU impacts on selected sub-basins presented on Fig. 8-12. Short explanations on how total flood impacts in Table 2 were calculated would also prove inspiring. 	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>New map was developed</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	An additional brush of the English language would increase the publishing value of the article.	All the grammar has been checked
Optional/General comments	The article under review is interesting and original but it still needs some further improvements, stated above. Nevertheless, it used proper GIS analysis techniques, producing valuable flood-risk impact assessment (hydrologic – SWAT) models in varying drainage river-basins of a generally highly-exposed and vulnerable geographical area.	<p>Yes, all the analysis are done within the GIS software</p> <p>Thank for you good observations and best regards.</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	