



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. 	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prasun Dutta
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Engineering Science And Technology , India