



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_50576
Title of the Manuscript:	Flood Management Model In Digital Era, Using SAST (Strategic Assumption Surfacing and Testing) and the Exponential Comparison Method (ECM) : A Case Study in Jakarta
Type of the 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	<p>The topic is useful, as communication and community involvement play a vital role in planning properly to lessen the impact of floods that have become an yearly recurring phenomenon in many countries, including Indonesia.</p> <p>The manuscript is full of typographic mistakes .Major content of the manuscript has been taken from the published literature. Abstract and Introduction are not properly structured. Title of the manuscript sounds good. Unfortunately, the contribution by the author is very limited. Since borrowed details from literature survey give useful information the manuscript may be accepted after incorporating the changes inserted by me in red.</p> <p>It is difficult to pinpoint plagiarism, even though some of the references quoted in the References subsection are not included / detailed in the main text. Sources of figures are not inserted below the figure captions. This is essential.</p> <p>Let the author realise that manuscript writing should be done with commitment and focus. One can see how callously the manuscript has been structured, including figure and table numbers.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, a lot of input that is very useful in improving this paper. Some revision in accordance with recommendation as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have revised the paper according to the input written in red. • Structural improvements also have been carried out in accordance with the recommendations • All information cited included the source, with a scientifically reasonable citation system. • Error in numbering images and tables have been corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	Please see the above	
Optional/General comments	Please see column 1	



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>	