



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"> • SWAT methodology / procedure • Parameter considered within the sub basin for the analysis • Calculation of Flood hazard and its comparison with advance approach • Rainfall trend in the study area 	It was listed and mentioned in line 125 Sub-basin parameters are used to determined the hydrologic response units It was corrected by indexing of flood impacts using HRUs numbers Rainfall pattern was one of the input data in SWAT and has been built in the database of ArcSWAT 2012.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uniformity in writing HRU in capital letter. Since it is observed that most of the time it is written as HRU and some time as Hru. • Uniformity in writing the Literature review in Introduction chapter. Some time it is written as [1], sometimes as 2013 et al • Lack of Clarity in figure • Unit representation in the table for the area affected by flood 	Yes noted and corrected
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style of writing/ Language Improvement 	Has been improved Thank you for your valuable observation, it is scholarly and really appreciate it

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	