

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_97705
Title of the Manuscript:	Upper Kolab Reservoir longevity under jeopardy: Odisha
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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	In my opinion, the manuscript is useful for scientific community  Actually, the title was fine and OK, but if I may suggest the title, please be more specific related to the content and objective of the research.  It is suggested that the " <b>Abstract</b> " should be organized more logically, including the background, objective, method, result and conclusion. Please check and revise.  In my opinion, the structure of the manuscript was appropriate and well organize.  Yes, the manuscript was scientifically correct.  In my opinion, the references were sufficient and recent, and also support relate the research.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	In my opinion, the English quality of the manuscript was suitable for scholarly communications and clearly.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript was well-prepared and comprehensive explanation. I recommend to accept, but need to revise (minor revision) the manuscript before its publication.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dedy Kristanto
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran", Indonesia