

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_101017
Title of the Manuscript:	Peoples' Perception on the impacts of the hydro-meteorological disasters in the upper Beas basin in the Kullu Valley, Himachal Pradesh, India
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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript gives an insight to the frequency and intensity of flash floods in the study area. It holds some information that can be built upon by the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title appropriately suits the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract, though a bit mixed up is comprehensive enough to give details contained in the body of the work. I advise that the abstract should be written in a coherent manner.</p> <p>4. The subsections are adequately structured. The structuring is clear and concise.</p> <p>5. The manuscript has not shown any reason to doubt its output.</p> <p>6. The references are well spread and includes recent literature. The references should be checked to ensure it is in line with recommended journal style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author has a moderately fair command of English Language. However, the use of the word "the" should be restricted to where necessary. The author(s) should improve on their command of English Language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Oji Iheukwumere
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria