

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_125670
Title of the Manuscript:	Applicability of HEC-RAS and Geospatial Tools for Inland Waterways Transportation Corridor Extension Study. Case Study of Ganga Basin, Bihar, India.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 presents a valuable study on the use of HEC-RAS and geospatial tools for the development of inland waterways transportation corridors in the Ganga Basin, Bihar, India. It contributes to the growing body of research focused on sustainable transportation and disaster relief operations using hydrological and geospatial tools. The methodology is robust, and the findings are practical for policymakers. I appreciate how the authors have linked the results to policy implications and disaster relief operations, making the study relevant not only to researchers but also to practitioners and decision-makers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is appropriate and accurately reflects the scope and focus of the study.	
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 summarizes the objectives, methods, and key findings well. However, it could benefit from specific quantitative details, such as the navigable lengths identified for different rivers or potential reductions in logistics costs. Adding such numbers will enhance clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript is well-organized with appropriate subsections. However, adding a flowchart in the methodology section would further clarify the research workflow.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound and technically robust. The application of HEC-RAS and geospatial tools is well-justified, and the methodology aligns with the research objectives. The authors have provided clear evidence to support their findings, and the policy recommendations are based on the results. The integration of hydrological modeling with disaster relief operations adds a unique dimension to the study, enhancing its practical relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are relevant and cover both foundational and recent studies. However, I recommend including more recent literature (2020–2024) on the application of geospatial tools in inland waterways to strengthen the discussion further.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? The language is generally clear and readable, but a few grammatical errors and typos are present. A language check using Grammarly or similar software is recommended to enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	he manuscript provides significant insights into the application of inland waterways and disaster management strategies. It will be valuable not only to researchers but also to policymakers and logistics planners. The inclusion of a flowchart in the methodology section will enhance clarity, and the language could benefit from minor editing for smoother communication.	

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:	Sawant Sushant Anil
Department, University & Country	School of Life Sciences, JSS Academy of Higher Education & Research, India