

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_85067
Title of the Manuscript:	Density Current Simulations In Cold Fresh Water And Its Cabbeling phenomenon: A Comparative Analysis With Given Experimental Results.
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Related Work</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Paper lack a Section that discuss Related Work that is between Introduction and Methodology</li> </ol> <p><b>Result</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Most of the consulted Literature that the researcher used in the result validation where out of date [2, 2, 9, 12, 13, and 17]. There is need for up to date related works.</li> <li>3. Figures and Diagram in the result section need to be decentralized. The Figure consumed a lot of spaces within the article</li> </ol> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Contribution of the research was not clearly discussed</li> <li>2. The recommendation for future research work was not stated</li> <li>3. The limitation of the research was not presented</li> </ol> <p><b>References</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The references need to be updated, the review can able to see only few up to date related articles. Most of the literatures are within 1983-2016 which was consider bad idea of the Genuity of the research</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Grammatical Errors</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Their exist Grammatical Errors within Method, Result and conclusion. The Researcher used so many <b>We</b> and <b>Our</b> in the text presentation</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I hope the Author will comply with the giving corrections.	

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yahaya Garba Shawai
Department, University & Country	National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria