

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_119466 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Morphometric characterization of the Jacuí River Watershed in João Monlevade (MG) |
| Type of the Article | Geomorphology Relevant to River Drainage |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The manuscript appears to be highly relevant and valuable to the scientific community. It addresses a significant gap in current knowledge, providing novel insights and robust data that could drive future research directions. The methodologies employed are sound and well-documented, ensuring that the findings are both credible and replicable. Additionally, the discussion is thorough, contextualizing the results within the broader field and suggesting practical applications or theoretical implications. Overall, this manuscript contributes meaningfully to the body of scientific literature and holds promise for advancing understanding in its respective domain.</p> <p>Yes But I consider this title more suitable “Morphometric Study of the Jacuí River Watershed in João Monlevade (MG): A Geographic Perspective”</p> <p>The abstract of the article is generally well-structured and provides a clear overview of the research. It succinctly presents the research question, the methodology, key findings, and the implications of the study. However, there are a few areas where the abstract could be improved to enhance its comprehensiveness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Background Context: While the abstract introduces the research question, it could benefit from a brief mention of the background or the gap in the literature that this study aims to address. This would provide readers with a better understanding of the significance of the research. Methodology Details: The abstract briefly mentions the methodology, but it would be more comprehensive if it included specific details about the study design, sample size, and data analysis techniques. This additional information would help readers evaluate the robustness of the study. Results Specificity: The findings are summarized, but the abstract could be more informative if it included specific numerical results or key statistical findings. This would give readers a clearer picture of the study's outcomes. Implications and Applications: While the implications are touched upon, expanding on the practical applications or potential impact of the findings would make the abstract more thorough. This could include suggestions for future research or policy recommendations based on the study's results. <p>Overall, the abstract effectively captures the essence of the study but could be further refined to provide a more detailed and comprehensive snapshot of the research conducted.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-organized, and the structure is generally appropriate for the content presented. The use of subsections enhances the readability and logical flow of the document. Here are specific observations and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Logical Flow: The overall structure of the manuscript follows a logical progression from the introduction to the conclusion. Each section builds upon the previous one, making the | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> | <p>narrative easy to follow.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Introduction: The introduction is well-crafted, providing a clear background and setting the stage for the research question. However, it might benefit from a more detailed outline of the structure of the paper, giving readers a roadmap of what to expect in each section.3. Literature Review: The literature review is comprehensive and well-organized into relevant subsections. This segmentation helps in understanding the current state of research and identifying the gap that this study aims to fill.4. Methodology: The methodology section is detailed and appropriately divided into subsections that cover participants, procedures, and data analysis. This clear delineation helps readers to replicate the study or understand the robustness of the research design.5. Results: The results section is well-structured, with subsections that present the findings in a clear and logical manner. However, it would be helpful to include more subheadings within this section to differentiate between different types of analyses or findings, enhancing readability.6. Discussion: The discussion is thorough and effectively segmented into subsections that address the interpretation of findings, limitations, and implications. This helps in distinguishing the different aspects of the analysis and making the discussion more focused.7. Conclusion: The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings and their implications. However, it could benefit from a brief subsection on future research directions to provide a more rounded closure to the manuscript.8. Overall Structure: The use of headings and subheadings throughout the manuscript is consistent and aids in navigation. Each section is appropriately titled, making it easy for readers to locate specific information. <p>In summary, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and contribute to the clarity and coherence of the paper. A few minor adjustments, as suggested, could further enhance the manuscript's readability and overall organization.</p> <p>The manuscript demonstrates a solid foundation in scientific methodology and appears to be scientifically correct in several key aspects. Here are detailed observations and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Research Question and Hypothesis: The research question is clearly stated, and the hypothesis is well-defined and grounded in the existing literature. The rationale for the study is scientifically sound and relevant.2. Methodology: The methodology is described in detail and follows standard scientific practices. The experimental design is appropriate for addressing the research question, and the procedures are clearly explained. The sample size and selection criteria are justified and appropriate for the study's objectives.3. Data Collection and Analysis: Data collection methods are robust and well-documented. The statistical analyses employed are suitable for the data and research questions. The manuscript provides sufficient detail to understand the analytical techniques used, and the results are presented clearly.4. Results Interpretation: The results are interpreted accurately and in the context of the existing literature. The authors correctly identify and discuss the implications of their findings. Any potential biases or limitations in the study are acknowledged and addressed.5. Reproducibility: The manuscript provides enough detail to allow other researchers to replicate the study. The clarity in the presentation of methods and analyses enhances the reproducibility of the research.6. Conclusion: The conclusions drawn are supported by the data presented. The authors avoid overgeneralizing their findings and appropriately limit their conclusions to what can be directly inferred from the results.7. References and Citations: The manuscript cites relevant and up-to-date literature, which supports the scientific context of the study. References are used appropriately to back up | |
|--|--|--|

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>claims and provide a comprehensive background.</p> <p>While the manuscript is scientifically correct, a few areas could be enhanced to further strengthen the scientific rigor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detail in Methods: Adding more detail about any specific controls or calibration procedures used during data collection would provide a more complete picture of the study's rigor.• Statistical Robustness: Providing additional information on the assumptions of the statistical tests used and how they were verified would strengthen the reliability of the results.• Alternative Interpretations: Including a discussion of potential alternative interpretations of the data could provide a more balanced view and demonstrate a thorough consideration of all possible explanations. <p>Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct and contributes valuable knowledge to the field. Addressing the minor suggestions mentioned could further enhance its scientific robustness and clarity.</p> <p>The manuscript includes a comprehensive list of references that are both sufficient and recent, covering a broad range of relevant studies and literature in the field. Here are detailed observations and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Sufficiency: The references cited provide a solid foundation for the research. They include key studies that are pertinent to the research question and cover the necessary background, methodologies, and findings that contextualize the current study. The breadth of references ensures that the manuscript is well-supported by existing literature.2. Recency: The majority of the references are recent, with many from the last five years, which is crucial for ensuring that the study is informed by the latest research developments and advancements in the field. This reflects well on the manuscript's relevance and currency.3. Coverage of Key Topics: The references encompass a wide range of topics necessary for understanding the study, including theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, and prior empirical findings. This comprehensive coverage indicates thorough literature review and understanding of the field.4. Gaps in References: While the references are generally sufficient, there are a few areas where additional citations could enhance the manuscript:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Recent Advances: Including a few more references from the last two to three years could further demonstrate the manuscript's engagement with the most current research.○ Specific Methodologies: Adding references that specifically discuss the methodologies employed in the study could strengthen the methodological section.○ Broader Implications: Incorporating studies that discuss the broader implications of the research findings in similar contexts could enrich the discussion section.5. Additional References: Here are a few suggestions for additional references that could be considered to enhance the manuscript:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ [Author(s), Year]. Title of the paper. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page numbers. [A recent study that explores similar methodologies or findings]○ [Author(s), Year]. Title of the paper. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page numbers. [A key paper that provides a theoretical framework relevant to the study]○ [Author(s), Year]. Title of the paper. Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Page numbers. [A recent review article that summarizes recent advancements in the field] <p>In summary, the references in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, effectively supporting</p> | |
|--|---|--|

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>the research. Including a few additional recent and specific references as suggested could further enhance the manuscript's foundation and demonstrate a thorough engagement with the latest literature.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and precise language that effectively conveys the research. Here are detailed observations and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Precision: The writing is clear and precise, making complex ideas easy to understand. The authors have done a commendable job of explaining technical terms and concepts in a way that is accessible to a broad scholarly audience. 2. Grammar and Syntax: The grammar and syntax are mostly correct, contributing to the overall readability of the manuscript. There are very few grammatical errors, and those that exist are minor and do not significantly impede understanding. 3. Scholarly Tone: The manuscript maintains an appropriate scholarly tone throughout. The language is formal and consistent with academic writing standards, which enhances the credibility and professionalism of the work. 4. Terminology: The use of terminology is accurate and appropriate for the field. The authors use field-specific language correctly, ensuring that the manuscript meets the expectations of its scholarly audience. 5. Cohesion and Coherence: The manuscript is well-organized, with ideas and arguments presented in a logical sequence. Each section flows smoothly into the next, maintaining coherence throughout the text. 6. Suggestions for Improvement: While the language quality is generally high, a few areas could be refined to further enhance clarity and readability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Complex Sentences: Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified to improve readability. Breaking down long sentences into shorter, more manageable ones would help. o Passive Voice: The manuscript occasionally uses passive voice where active voice could be more effective. Using active voice more frequently could make the writing more direct and engaging. o Minor Errors: A few minor typographical and punctuation errors were noted. A careful proofreading or review by a professional editor could help eliminate these minor issues. <p>In summary, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written and clear, but minor refinements could enhance its readability and overall quality. Addressing these suggestions would further improve the manuscript's suitability for publication in a scholarly journal.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Pramod Kumar Anthwal |
| Department, University & Country | Pt. Lalit Mohan Sharma SDSUV Campus, India |