



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_49417
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Climate Change in the stream flow, crop yields and NP levels at White Oak Bayou Watershed Using SWAT simulation: A Case Study
Type of the Article	Case study

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	<p>It is a good topic and well presented. However, there are some basic limitations, which should be eliminated. Details given below need to be incorporated, to the extent essential.</p> <p>In general it is noticed by scientists that temperature increase by 2100 could be of the order of 2 degree C. Efforts are being made to reduce at least by ½ degree by drastically reducing fossil fuel emissions. 4 degree increase by 2100 is rather high. Many believe the temperature rise could be on an average half to one degree. Since there is a clear debate regarding temperature increase in the scientific circles, it is better if authors take two ranges of temperature, namely, 2 and 4 degrees and show the relative change in all the factors including reduction in stream flow and reduction in Phosphorous etc. This would help in bringing out the probable variations in various components, including crop yields.</p> <p>Number of typographic errors are noticed in presenting degrees. This needs to be looked into. Whenever figures are downloaded from other publications, it is essential to give source of the fig. This is essential to avoid plagiarism.</p> <p>At places study area details are repeated. This unnecessarily increases the length of the manuscript.</p>	<p>Revised as recommended.</p> <p>Please note that most figures were generated from the SWAT software yet references were indicated as advised.</p> <p>Yes two ranges of temperature, namely, 2 and 4 degrees were originally tested but only the 4 degrees showed relative change in all the factors including reduction in stream flow and reduction in Phosphorous etc. therefore it was not presented. And so it clearly indicates 2 degrees should be maintained for low emission scenario as shown in Figure 4. This is incorporated in the conclusion as advised.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Details given above be attended to	Revised as recommended.
Optional/General comments	Good topic and useful. It is essential if area specific observations are collected to strengthen the importance of the case study.	Thank you.



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	