

**Review Form 1.7**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJECC_105816</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Effect of different storage vessels on rainwater harvested from different rooftops (Case study of rainwater harvested in Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria)</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. <b>Yes, the result are so important for some communities who use rainwater or domestic used. Much important results</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, nothing to say conserning the title</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, all the different part of abstract are readable</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, but according to me, the author must separate the result au discussion because the analyse of result table are in discussion</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, but the author must complet it discussion with much reference</b></p> <p>6. <b>No, the reference are not sufficient</b></p> |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | No comment for the language its okay.  |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | The article is so rich with much result, but i suggest to author the separation of the result to the discussion. But if the method used here is result and discussion in one part, it's okay. If not, it is important to analyse the table before the discussion.  |  |

**PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Konan Brou Richmond</b>                          |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Felix Houphouet, Côte d'Ivoire</b> |