

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102666
Title of the Manuscript:	Site Selection for Rainwater Harvesting using remote sensing, GIS and AHP
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)	1. Yes, as far as I can tell. The potential RWH suitability site selection process in this paper is very practical 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is fine. 3. The subsection and structure of this paper are suitable. 4. The result of this paper is correct. 5. This paper is sound, technically. 6. It should cite more recent publication as possible. 7. The methodology of site selection level (section 3.4, such as "not suitable, less suitable, moderately suitable, high suitable and very high suitable") must be described in detail.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fine.	
Optional/General comments	The conclusions summarize the findings but there are a few factors such as the water supply reliability of RWH which were not considered. It can be described on conclusion and recommendations.	

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:	Yao-Lung Tsai
Department, University & Country	Aletheia University, China