



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_45173</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Quantitative Morphometric Analysis of Adula Watershed, Ahmednagar Maharashtra Using Arc-GIS tool</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Full paper</b>

**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 comments	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit to 200 words maximum – see journal guidelines</li> <li>Grammar generally poor – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicate when this study was done</li> <li>Paragraph 1: indicate source(s) of this information.</li> <li>Paragraph 2: Indicate source(s) of this information.</li> <li>Sources used general very old – upgrade most to recent (2013-2018).</li> <li>Line 39: <i>Kharif</i> – give equivalent English name.</li> <li>Line 51: "The remote sensing ..." – This constitutes a new paragraph on GIS</li> <li>Line 54/55 – "Advancement of technology ..." - indicate source of this information</li> <li>Line 58: "... a great amount of research has focussed ..." – only 2 (Abrahams, 1984; Huggett and Cheesman, 2002) listed as illustration of great amount.</li> <li>Line 61: References (Abrahams, 1984; Huggett and Cheesman, 2002) to be placed appropriately <u>inside</u> preceding sentences not all at end of sentence.</li> <li>Line 71: References (Singh, 1998; Khakhlari and Nandy, 2016) to be placed appropriately <u>inside</u> preceding sentences not all at end of sentence.</li> <li>Lines 76: remove: "...slope and profile of land <del>has been responsible for the natural development of basin</del> (Horton..."</li> <li>Lines 77-82: Remove "In recent decades, the morphometric analysis of the various River basins, have been done ... laborious, and cumbersome also."- Report on what they found not on what they did.</li> <li>Line 82: "Proper planning..." – This constitutes a new paragraph on problem statement, aim of study and value of study.</li> <li>Line 82: Insert problem statement sentence (reason for doing this study) in this specific Basin/Watershed.</li> <li>Just too many issues to further indicate here – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicate when this study was done</li> <li>Use metric system (km, meters), not imperial system (miles, feet)</li> <li>Figure 1: Does not indicate Adula River or Pravara River (as indicated on line 89-90.</li> <li>Line 95: "The catchment area...222.07 km<sup>-2</sup>" - Relocate to end of sentence on line 98.</li> <li>Figure 1. Legend – Location <del>map</del> of the study area.</li> <li>Much methodology to be found in the results and discussion section – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Horton (1945) is used too much – reduce reference to this publication.</li> <li>The combination of results and discussion is the domain of Short Communications (&lt;12 pages). In a full paper (as this manuscript is) the two sections are separated.</li> <li>Line 112-113: "The stream ordering ...with some modifications" – <u>remove this is NOT a discussion of results found. This is a serious problem with this paper. The reporting of definitions and concepts generally associated with GIS, is not appropriate as a replacement for the discussion of results found. There is actually very little discussion focussing on the MEANING of the results via up-to-date literature – a serious drawback of this manuscript. This result in a serious reformulation required for the discussion of the results.</u></li> <li>Line 154: "it was computed by using ..." – this belong in methodology and should be</li> </ol>	<p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers. We have thankfully acknowledged the contribution of the reviewers in the acknowledgement section of this manuscript.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>removed from this section – similar issues in lines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 156-159</li> <li>• 175</li> <li>• 180</li> <li>• 259-261</li> </ul> <p><b>28.</b> Discussion focusses on what these values mean in general, but not in terms of Adula watershed. <i>Thus current discussion of no value!</i> Discussion should be refocussed on Adula watershed. What does all this mean in terms of the planning and management of the Basin for sustainable development (as indicated on lines 82/83 of the Introduction)?</p> <p><b>29.</b> Just too many issues to further indicate here – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p><b>30.</b> No insight presented. No limitations to study presented. No future studies listed - Looks like discussion – can be used (partly) as part of a newly constituted discussion of the results. Reformulate.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p><b>31.</b> Too many old references used.</p> <p><b>32.</b> Some references incomplete (e.g. Bera et al. – volume number?</p> <p><b>33.</b> Too many inconsistencies regarding punctuation, format etc.</p> <p><b>34.</b> Just too many issues to further indicate here – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>General comments:</b></p> <p>Grammar needs serious upgrading – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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