

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121118
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Groundwater Prospect Zones in Wakawali Watershed of Ratnagiri District of Maharashtra, India Using Geospatial and AHP Technology
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work presents and seeks to upscale the use of GIS and Remote Sensing in water resources exploration. This is commendable in this era where the use of technology is advancing. It is a good route for most countries to adopt.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title seems suitable. However, it would be improved to "Geospatial groundwater site selection using AHP-GIS based Technology".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract has to be beefed up by adding some quantitative findings and a recommendation on how the results would influence policies in groundwater management or planning in the country.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections seem suitable.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology has to be updated by adding equations and detailed approaches so that one can easily replicate the same elsewhere. As it is, it is deficient in that aspect. One cannot easily follow how all the steps were done. The results should then follow from the identified steps. How weights were identified is not clear. It should be detailed enough.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references have to be updated. However, most of them are within the past 10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is acceptable though it has to be improved grammar wise in some sentences.	
Optional/General comments	The work is good but it would be better once the sections have been improved.	

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 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sylvester Richard Chikabvumbwa
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Malawi, Malawi