

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_106462</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Estimation of Runoff by SWAT Model in Noyyal River Basin</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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community. Because it uses software and recent data to study a natural phenomenon before making future decisions.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript Are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are insufficient but recent, I would like to add references for authors who have worked in arid and dry areas of Africa, as there are several works using SWAT model to control runoff.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes, The linguistic/English quality of the article is suitable for scientific papers</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I noticed that the UTM GS 1984 projection does not show the zone number and the northern hemisphere; at the same time, there is no statistical validation confirming the reliability of the final results. but be careful if you use daily data, you must check for any missing data and statistically study the normality of the distribution. finally the durations of the studies are different between the introduction (33 years) and the conclusion (28 years)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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:	<b>Rata Mohamed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Djillali Bounaama University of Khemis, Algeria</b>