

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_114287</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Rain water harvesting to manage the water scarcity and flood</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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. Yes 2. No , I SUGGEST THE following title: <b>Design of Rain water harvesting system for efficient water scarcity and flood management in....., India</b> 3. No 4. No 5. Somehow yes 6. No</p> <p>Other comments relates to the absence of in-text references, even the list of refences is very poor. The author should indicate the research gap in the introduction and he/ her intervention in terms of novelty/ innovation.</p> <p>The author should know how the result analysis and discussion are done scientifically The methodology is poorly described</p> <p>Th author does not know how the discussion is done</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some grammatical errors are still present in the tex</p> <p>Scientific writing skills are missing in the manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Generally the manuscript is not well written following the format of the journal, the idea is good and once guided with provided comments the author can improve.</p> <p>The idea is good but , the author has poor writing skills</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>Ndokoye Pancras</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Technology and Arts of Byumba, Rwanda</b>