

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_101017</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Peoples' Perception on the impacts of the hydro-meteorological disasters in the upper Beas basin in the Kullu Valley, Himachal Pradesh, India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is researchable and scientifically sound with a few changes if captured. The disasters are all over and problematic word wide. The area is quite worth of research especially now with lots of effect from climate change issues.</p> <p>2. The title is too wordy. I suggest: Impact of Hydro meteorological disasters on people- perception in-----</p> <p>3. the abstract too long but not comprehensive. The statement problem does not come out clearly; Sampling strategy, design and data analysis not captured well. How the author measured perception not understood, how the sample size was arrived at not well elaborated.</p> <p>4 The sub sections and structure not bad. But I suggest the following format:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The title</li> <li>ii) Abstract</li> <li>iii) introduction</li> <li>iv) Research methodology_ study area description briefly and include study map</li> <li>v) Results- specific objective being handle and how the objective will be achieved, i.e sub-topics under it.</li> <li>vi) Conclusion and recommendation</li> <li>vii) Acknowledgement- the people and organization that were of great value</li> </ul> <p>5. the manuscript is scientifically correct if some changes are incorporated</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but let the author use most recent atleast from 2017 to date if possible.</p> <p>7. triangulation of results not properly done the percentages should be accompanied by frequencies from the total sample for example; 70% ( Of 251 becomes the % frequency of the respondents</p> <p>8. Indicate sample size N=251 OR 384 in your figures.</p> <p>9. Avoid duplication of titles in the figures in side and labelling.</p> <p>10. The author has not discussed the results but just elaborated the results. Should be able to discuss the results and critic. Which results agrees with who and how. Disagreement and how Bring out how the problem has been handled and the recommendation both academic and policy</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is okay but the author should look at the punctuation marks all through the manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript title is researchable and current relevant to the current situations</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Opilo Betty Nasambu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya</b>