



**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 has been responsible for the natural development of basin (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 map 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>	



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>28. 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>29. Just too many issues to further indicate here – see accompanied scanned revised manuscript.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>30. 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>31. Too many old references used.</p> <p>32. Some references incomplete (e.g. Bera et al. – volume number?</p> <p>33. Too many inconsistencies regarding punctuation, format etc.</p> <p>34. 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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Martin Potgieter</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Limpopo, South Africa</b>