

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95781
Title of the Manuscript:	Integration of Remote Sensing and GIS for Modelling Surface Run-Off: The Case of Sharq Elneel, Sudan
Type of the Article	CASE STUDY

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>)

I'm Kobby_Python skill up event coordina

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Title:</p> <p>--I humbly suggest a modification of the title to avoid ambiguity. The title could read as: “Integration of Remote Sensing and GIS for modelling surface run-off: The Case of Sharq Elneel, Sudan”</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>-Some repetitive phrases within the abstract have been deleted.</p> <p>-The abstract must have a concluding sentence which briefly states the significance of the study's outcome.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>-There should be additional paragraphs which briefly captures some underlying theories which engulfs some sustainable development goals, risks and disaster management, climate variability and so on to enrich the literature or background to this study.</p> <p>-Again, the other paragraph could capture or cover research progress, in relation to other studies conducted elsewhere which utilized GIS and remote sensing techniques.</p> <p>-Authors could briefly highlight the contribution of this study or study's significance to industrial players, policy-makers, development strategists and the international research community in the last paragraph or last but one paragraph. --The current introduction is certainly not enough and must be expanded.</p> <p>Study Area:</p> <p>-Figure 1: I humbly suggest the authors separate the caption of fig.1 from the image. It is inappropriate and unacceptable to crop or merge the caption along with the image. In this instance, it isn't a legend; hence, must be separated.</p> <p>-Since this study is a case study, authors are advised to use or state the coordinates (longitudes/latitudes) for the study area since the key elements applied are GIS/remote sensing.</p> <p>-the word “below” was deleted because Figure 1 is self-explanatory and does not need anything to show its position or qualify it.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>-The methodology section needs to be restructured or re-organized with more details. What is presented here is unacceptable.</p> <p>-Authors need to state the source of data acquisition, specific version of the QGIS software used, the key variables or parameters which were used for the topographical/hydrological models.</p> <p>-Studies like these require a workflow or flow-chart that could guide readers on reference and input data, software or tools for data processing and analysis, among others.</p> <p>-Just like Fig. 1, authors need to separate the caption of Fig. 2 from the image. It is suggested that</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>authors use legends to describe the parameters in Fig. 2. Scales could be added where necessary.</p> <p>-For data analysis/processing, it is important for authors to highlight what specific analysis techniques were employed or utilized with justifications. Example: ROI, Maximum Likelihood Algorithms, Type of classifications used and so on.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>-For clarity, consistency and coherence, results must be presented in orderly and precise manner.</p> <p>-Since Fig. 2 forms part of the results, the section must first be introduced, followed by a presentation of the study's results. All the explanations or discussions must be moved to the discussion section.</p> <p>-The causes or drivers and implications must be clearly presented in tabular or image formats.</p> <p>-Authors could use tables to highlight historic flooding events in the study area.</p> <p>-Authors should kindly adhere to the journal's standardized format of organizing sections (Abstract, Introduction, Study Area/Methodology, Results, Discussions and Conclusions, followed by the references, acknowledgements, conflicts of interests and so on) in their manuscript. Data processing or analysis is always placed in the methodology section. The results section must stand on its own since it is an important aspect of the work.</p> <p>Lines 87-89: All data analysis or processing parts must be moved to the methodology section and be placed under the data analysis section.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>-The discussion must have a brief introduction followed by an explanation to the results presented.</p> <p>-The results of this study were not adequately explained or digested. Authors failed to compare the study's results to existing literature or other studies conducted elsewhere with similar scope.</p> <p>-Does the study's results support/agree or refute with/against existing literature. If it disagrees with studies elsewhere, what could be the reasons. If it agrees with other studies, it ought to be stated here with existing literature to back or substantiate it.</p> <p>-The drivers or causes of flooding events must be clearly explained with examples or reports to enrich the discussion aspect.</p> <p>-Again, trends or historic flooding events and its implications on economic activities/livelihoods, infrastructure and so on ought to be explained in the discussion section.</p> <p>-Mitigation/Adaptive measures and its effectiveness could be explained briefly also.</p> <p>***Note: Captions for each Figure (i.e., Figs. 1-5) must be cropped out or separated from them since they are not legends.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>-The study's significance must be integrated in the last part of the conclusion.</p> <p>-The study's limitations/gaps and opportunities that could potentially drive further or future studies must be stated also in the last part of the conclusion.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>-Wikipedia references are unacceptable and inappropriate for scientific papers. Again, authors should refer to the journal's format of citing data or information on websites. The current format is wrong and incomplete.</p> <p>-The reference section needs to be recited or worked on. Poorly cited with less literature linked to journal papers, reports and so on.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>-Major grammatical defects and syntax errors were identified throughout the manuscript. Moderate revisions were made to draw authors' attention to such errors. Authors are advised to seek for the help of someone with command over English Language or excellent proficiency skills to improve the proficiency and flow of the manuscript before resubmission after revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally informative and has the needed ingredients to influence policy. However, it is clearly far from being ready for publication or acceptance. Authors need to consider the major comments raised carefully to improve the overall nature (i.e., robustness and proficiency levels) of the paper.</p>	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute for History of Science and Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China