



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_49870
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Models for Clean Water Investigation in Malaysia's River Basin
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments:	<p>Although the research topic is very interesting and current in the scheme of things; the following were the reviewers' observation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The title should be recast. Suggested topic ' A Comparative Study of Discrete Dynamic System (DDS) and Moving Average (MV) Models in Assessing and Predicting Availability of Clean Water.</li><li>2. Abstract: The abstract is not well crafted. Poor tenses were observed e.g, futuristic tense instead of past tense in reporting 'we will'. The abstract need to be restructured</li><li>3. Introduction: The literatures are current but not sufficient. See Taylor et al. 2010, Omorogieva et al. 2016 and host of others. The problem of tense and sentence linkage were prominent.</li><li>4. Methodology: The methodology is not clear. The author (s) should kindly state how they obtained their data set, and how they arrived at their ratio of clean water in their presented tables. The formula (e) used should be well stated and the heading should be the 'ration of clean water to.....'</li><li>5. Results: The results were properly presented but not well discussed. The authors are advice to discuss the results in details for clarity of readership.</li><li>6. Conclusion: The elements of conclusion were available to conclude, but the conclusion was not well concluded. Authors are advice to recast the conclusion.</li><li>7. References: Cited journals were well reference.</li></ol>	The manuscript has been modified
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	