Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_115515**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Rainfall-Runoff Modeling using MIKE11 NAM Model for Ravishankar Sagar Catchment, Chhattisgarh**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1.- Yes, the manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it enhances understanding of rainfall-runoff modeling, contributes to water resource management strategies, and offers methodological insights that can be applied in similar hydrological studies worldwide.** **2 Yes, the title "Rainfall-Runoff Modeling using MIKE11 NAM Model for Ravishankar Sagar Catchment, Chhattisgarh" is suitable as it concisely reflects the main content and geographical focus of the study, providing clear insight into the research topic and methodology used.** **3.- Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and implications, providing a clear overview of the research and its contributions to the field of hydrological modeling and water resource management, but may be improved** **4.- Yes, they follow a logical flow, starting from an introduction to the problem, describing the study area, detailing the methodology (including model setup, data input, calibration, and validation), presenting results, discussing implications, and concluding with the study's contributions and potential future research directions. This structure is conducive to clear communication of the research process and findings.** **5.- Based on the provided summary, the manuscript appears scientifically correct. It may need to be checked for plagiarism.** **6.- No, they need to improve, and need to consider the following:** **https://kipdf.com/rainfall-runoff-modeling-using-conceptual-nam-model_5ac465a51723dd2836a73e5b.html** **https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40808-020-01054-8?** **To improve the manuscript, consider the following:** **Update References: Incorporate more recent studies to ensure the research context is up-to-date.** **Comparative Analysis: Adding comparisons with other models could enrich the findings.** **Climate Change Considerations: Discuss potential impacts of climate change on rainfall-runoff patterns.** **Technical Details: Ensure more detailed explanation of model calibration and validation processes.** **Language Clarity: A review by a native English speaker could enhance clarity and correctness.** **Graphical Representations: Enhance figures and tables for better clarity and information presentation.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In the abstract "The MIKE 11 NAM model accurately predicted daily runoff and adequately reproduced the hydrological response," please define "accurately" and "adequately" (Put the numbers) Improve figure 1,2, 5, 6, 9 Table 1 In general, different formats are used, like it were "butched " for somewhere else	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Edgar Arturo Chávez-Urbiola**
Department, University & Country	**National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico**