

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_117734
Title of the Manuscript:	Livelihood Vulnerability Index: A systematic approach to assess downstream effect of dam on livelihood vulnerability of riparian dwellers - Case of Mukutmanipur dam, Kangsabati river
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journalajgr.com/index.php/AJGR/editorial-policy>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <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>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community given the current challenges posed by climate change.</p> <p>The title is suitable however, it can be modified. E.g An assessment of the downstream effect of dams on livelihood vulnerability index of riparian dwellers – A case of Mukutmanipur dam (Kangsabati river). It would be better to include the state or country for clarity.</p> <p>It is compressive. It would be better if the author indicated the methodology used as well since I can see the sampling techniques highlighted. Yes, but here's need to separate the recommendations from the conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient but are not very recent. The most recent reference is of 2017 whereas there is recent available data which the author can use to supplement or validate the work. I can see endnotes reflected in the paper.</p> <p>Good efforts seen, keep writing.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There's need to do editing to rid the paper of grammatical errors, omissions and redundant words that are in it. For example, lastly, then lastly in the conclusion</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The study is suitable for publication if the above minor comments are addressed and I wish the author well.</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:	Alungat Barbara
Department, University & Country	United Nations Mandated University for Peace, Police Senior Command and Staff College-Bwebajja, Uganda