

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126214
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of waterlogging and mitigation strategies for the micro watershed in Akola District of Vidarbha region
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in current research, providing valuable insights that could inform future studies. The authors employ innovative methodologies that enhance the reliability of their findings, making a meaningful contribution to the field. I appreciate this manuscript for its clarity and well-structured presentation, which effectively communicates complex ideas to a broad audience. Overall, its implications for both academic research and practical applications make it a noteworthy addition to the literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive, effectively summarizing the key objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It provides a clear overview of the study, which is essential for engaging readers. However, I suggest adding a brief statement about the broader implications of the findings to enhance its impact. Additionally, including specific metrics or key results could strengthen the abstract further by giving readers a clearer sense of the study's significance. Overall, it's a solid abstract that could benefit from these minor enhancements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It lacks discussion and recommendation. It needs rework	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific correctness of this manuscript is commendable, as it demonstrates a thorough understanding of the topic and employs appropriate methodologies. The data presented are well-analysed, with clear statistical support for the conclusions drawn. Additionally, the authors provide a comprehensive review of relevant literature, which strengthens the context and rationale for their research. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, making a valuable contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Add discussion and recommendation	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fekede Terefe Gemed
Department, University & Country	Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia