

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99563
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of sediment yield behaviour from a micro catchment area of a farm pond for storm wise runoff events in North-Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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. The result might be important for locals. The research has no conclusion. 2. The title seems to be suitable by some corrections. 3. The abstract is contains no results or significant contribution of the work. 4. They seem to be well managed. 5. The manuscript shows a routine practice. It does not add any new idea or discussion scientifically. 6. For such work, the reference must be OK.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language must go under some revision, grammatically and scientifically. The sense of the manuscript is not much scientific.	
Optional/General comments	The work is a good one; measuring sediment yield in a catchment is an important practice in land management practice. Although, we are facing a report of the sediment yield and it does not add any discussion in its scope of work.	

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:	Gholamreza Shoaie
Department, University & Country	Tarbiat Modares University, Iran