

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_119569
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of water exchange processes between groundwater and surface water in the Usangu Plains, Tanzania.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. No (please add some references related to different models and justify why you select BFI from others based on literatures you reviewed) <p>Detail comments:</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Good and clear <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Explains the topic with good procedure from general to a specific study area <p>Method and materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Data collection: the data record length is very short (2010 – 2019) which is 10 years data. For a trend analysis it is recommended to use long time recorded data, at least 30 years or greater. ✓ Figure 1 is not visible (latitude and longitude, legend, station name.....etc); increase the DPI value in your map and font size of the descriptions. ✓ In this figure, Station 1KA59A is out of your watershed. So how do you compare the hydrological properties of this station with other five stations? ✓ Table 1: the area of station1KA7A is small compared to the sixed station, it means that its contribution both in groundwater and surface water is minimal and the trend may also affect. So how to correlate this station with others? ✓ In this table, please include the mean annual flow of all stations by adding one column. ✓ Figure 2 and 3: it is better to plot the time series of discharge (m³/s) verses time (year) or Q (m³/s) verses time (months) rather than discharge in mm/month. ✓ What is the reason you select 3 base flow separation techniques from 11 methods? Having similar formula is only your justification? <p>Result and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The first 4 sentences in this part are already written under introduction and method parts. So, here no need of repetition. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Table 3: it is not a result, rather you collected from water office of Tanzania. So, it has to be put under materials and methods part, sub topic data sources. ✓ Table7: for the case of annual trend analysis there may not be clear trend either decreasing or increasing but for the seasonal time scale it is expected to increasing (wet season0 and decreasing (dry season) of ground water contribution to surface water. But your result here in table 7 shows there is no significant increasing or decreasing trend for both seasonal and annual analysis. How it could be? <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The first sentence for this part is very long (five lines) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comment</p> <p>This research paper has good information for readers to investigate more about groundwater and surface water interaction. The quantification of groundwater resource and surface water is a debate for many scientists. Therefore, the topic is timely but the way of conducting here is simply using only one model and thre is no observation data for groundwater 9well withdrawal data). If it was included, it will make the research better. However, this research paper has a vital importance for the particular study area as well other African countries. Therefore, I decided that the paper is accepted with minor revisions if the author corrected the following detail comments given line by line with the topics.</p> <p>Decision: Accepted with Minor revision</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kassa Abera Tareke</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Wollo University, Kombolcha Institute of Technology, Ethiopia</p>