



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_48418
Title of the Manuscript:	Water balance estimation using Integrated GIS-based WetSpass Model; the case of Birki Watershed, Eastern Tigray, Northern Ethiopia
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>TOPIC: The topic should be rephrase to read thus: Water balance estimation using Integrated GIS-based WetSpass Model in the Birki Watershed, Eastern Tigray, Northern Ethiopia.</p> <p>METHODS: The statistical methods (mean etc.) widely used by the author was not mentioned and justified by the author(s). This is very necessary.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: In item 5, the author(s) wrongly duplicated discussion with the conclusion. This had previously clarified in the item 4 under results and discussion.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: Apart making too many recommendations, the authors presented the ideas as conclusion in the first three points. The First three recommendations should either be removed or rephrased to suit the context.</p> <p>LANGUAGE: There incidences of poor sentence structures, inappropriate used of comas, poor used of full stops, grammars etc. Such errors as identified in the reviewed manuscript should be corrected accordingly.</p> <p>REFERENCES: Generally, the referencing format used in the Manuscript are not Science Domain compliance. The author(s) need to get appropriate document as basis and re-structure the in line with the Vancouver style approved by this Journal</p>	<p>Dear Reviewer, your concern was crucial and important and we can amend your comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript accordingly;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic were rephrased as "Water balance estimation using Integrated GIS-based WetSpass Model in the Birki Watershed, Eastern Tigray, Northern Ethiopia". 2. Methodology: from each raster layer simulated by the model we drive the statistical methods using raster layer source of each water balance component from ArcGIS environment. 3. Conclusion: Accepted and removed from the conclusion part 4. Recommendation: Accepted and removed from the original paper 5. Language: Accepted and we use ginger and grammarly software's to correct it grammatical and punctuation errors of the manuscript. 6. References: Accepted and we change it according the Science domain reference style/system.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comment	This is a good manuscript. The author(s) need to work on the identified flaws in order to get appropriate approval for the final publication.	Dear Reviewer, based on your crucial inputs we try to make the paper readable and acceptable for publication. And we thank you for your important inputs to in reach the paper and we had been working based on these comments.



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	No, there is no any ethical issues in this manuscript, based on the research ethics we try to acknowledge for those ideas taken from different reviewed papers through citation and referencing on the manuscript.