

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_99005
Title of the Manuscript:	The Delineation of Watersheds in the Dhenkanal district near Brahmani delta; a Geospatial study
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	- Overall, the manuscript idea is very important, however, the paper is not suitable for publication in the current form. - The title is somewhat consistent with the research content. However, it is requested to identify the country where the Dhenkanal district is (India). Also, it is recommended to highlight the method used to delineate the watershed. - The abstract is too long. It should be one concise and informative paragraph. The text must be connected horizontally through related sentences so that the flow of the text is established correctly. - Avoid using abbreviations in the keywords section. - The introduction must end with a brief paragraph of the objective or the purpose of your research. - Do not include the geographical context of the study area (Figure 1) in the introduction. Put it in an independent section. - The map in Figure 1 missed geographical coordinates, a north arrow, and an appropriate scale. - Include the "review literature" section in the Introduction. - Add a new section "The study area" after the introduction in which you incorporate the geography, the climate, geology, demography, land use, Agriculture, Irrigation... (Not in the method and materials section). - Some maps have missed the geographical coordinates. - Add the results section. - Figures (5-b, 7, 9, 12, and 13) are not cited in the text. - Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct. - References (5, 6, 17...) are not cited in the text. Each document in the references section must be cited in the text and vice-versa.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- There are many grammatical issues that need to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	- First, to get a complete and accurate review, the reviewer needs more than 2 or 3 days. Also, the paper has either no line numbering which made the reviewer task challenging.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abderrahim Ayad
Department, University & Country	Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco