

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_92562
Title of the Manuscript:	Trophic Status of Shanti Sagara Reservoir: Implications on Nutrient Management in Reservoir Catchment
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

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>COMMENTS ON MANUSCRIPT ID: Ms_AJEE_92562</p> <p>The manuscript presents “Trophic Status of Shanti Sagara Reservoir: Implications on Nutrient Management in Reservoir Catchment”, which is remarkable.</p> <p>The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal. However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. Appropriate revisions to the following points should be undertaken in order to justify recommendation for publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract should be informative and include the main findings. It would be proper if the authors should link the concentration of the water quality parameters in the study area to the geology or other sources in the area. - “Fig. 1: Seasonal water sampling location in Shanti Sagara reservoir, Channagiri Taluk,Davanagere District,Karnataka” is copied and pasted from google. The locations of the sampling stations should be shown with a better drawn map. The map should show its location in the world. - “Table 1: Characteristics of Shanti Sagara reservoir, Channagiri Taluk, Davanagere 104 District, Karnataka” There was no need for such a table. Information could be given in the text. - In the conclusion section, the limitations of this study, suggested improvements of this work and future directions should be highlighted. - Moreover, the manuscript could be substantially improved by relying and citing more on recent literatures about contemporary real-life case studies on sustainability and/or water quality such as the followings: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iswcr.2018.09.001 https://doi.org/10.1080/15275922.2020.1836074 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105815 https://doi.org/10.5004/dwt.2019.24225 <p>“Fig. 3 Soil sampling locations of Shanti Sagara reservoir catchment (May, 2022).” is copied and pasted from google. The locations of the sampling stations should be shown with a better drawn map. The map should show its location in the world.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please mention how permissible limits were determined, according to what? - The authors were compared the results with the standard acceptable levels established by unkown. What are the other feasible alternatives? What are the advantages of adopting these particular standards over others in this case? How will this affect the results? More details should be furnished. - “Fig. 4 The presence of cyanobacteria and macrophytes.” Is not clear. Please make it more clear and understandable for readers. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yalçın Tepe
Department, University & Country	Giresun University, Turkey