



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47346
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Wind-Induced Sediment Resuspension Zones in the Patzcuaro Lake Using Empirical Equations
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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"> The introduction part is not sufficient for getting the overall concept of present study. It should enlarge using some theoretical back ground with reference of some recent study. In fig 1 the axis should be defined clearly. What the values are indicating in the axis?? Details of data acquisition system should be given. Some of the technical terms like Bathymetry etc, should defined first for better understanding to the general reader of the manuscript. Unit is missing in table 4. The empirical equation (eq 3) used in this study, should have some reference if taken from previous study. If the authors proposed it then that should be indicated clearly. The legends of figure 3 are in b/w, but there are some colure spotted in the figure, justify this. Legends are missing in figure 4. Why the author select the particular wind velocity (12.2 m/s) in north direction for the contour map in figure 4. Similarly the calculation of total sediment resuspension area (one third of whole lake) should be given. Author have used the recorded wind velocity data and empirical equation for calculating the sediment resuspension of the lake but any compression of present outcome with actual sediment resuspension area is not found in the study. If there is some compression available, author should indicate that before concluding that "the empirical equations are an efficient tool..." in the conclusion part. The literature review part is pathetic. Only 9 numbers of references are present which are also very old. Some recent study should be included concerning the sediment resuspension. 	<p>We thank the reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions. Our reply to the reviewer queries is given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More recent references supporting the theoretical background are included in the revised manuscript. Figure 1 has been replaced for an updated one. Since the figure is schematic, geographical coordinate is not required and omitted in the revised document. The data was collected by the Mexican Institute of Water Technology (IMTA, by its acronym in Spanish). We only employed the data, but a reference is included in the revised manuscript in relation to the data gathering. Unit has been included in Table 4. Equation 3 is clearly referenced in the revised manuscript. The coloured spots were a printing issue only. It has been solved and no spots are present anymore in the revised figure. Legend is included in Figure 4 of the revised manuscript. The wind velocity of 12.2 lead to acritical scenario, and it resulted from adjusting one of the maximum recorded wind velocities with the Equation 1. This is pointed out in the revised manuscript. We have modified the writing and in the revised manuscript is now "the empirical equations are a practical tool..."; it is also mentioned that comparison versus actual measurements is suggested for further research. The original stated literature was enough for the pursued objective. Nevertheless, many more and recent references have been included in the revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	No ethical issues are involved with the submitted study.