

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121995
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

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.	<p>The manuscript "Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria" is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a pressing environmental issue that affects both ecosystems and human communities. The study provides valuable insights into the dynamics of riverbank erosion and its implications for stream morphology, which is critical for effective environmental management and conservation strategies.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough investigation and the detailed methodology employed, which enhances the reliability of the findings. The research not only contributes to the existing body of knowledge on riverbank erosion but also emphasizes the need for regulatory measures to mitigate its impacts, making it relevant for policymakers and environmental practitioners. Overall, the manuscript has the potential to inform future research and practical applications in river management and environmental protection.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title of the article, "Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria," is generally suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the research. However, it could be made more concise while retaining its informative nature.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title: "Impact of River Bank Erosion on Stream Morphology: A Case Study of the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Nigeria"</p> <p>This alternative title maintains the essential elements of the original while streamlining the wording, making it more accessible and easier to read. It emphasizes the study's focus on the impact of erosion and specifies the case study location, which is crucial for contextual understanding.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be enhanced by incorporating a few additional elements for greater comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explicit Research Objectives: Clearly state the primary research objectives at the beginning of the abstract. This will help readers quickly understand the purpose of the study. 2. Summary of Key Findings: While the abstract mentions significant impacts of bank erosion, it would benefit from a more detailed summary of the specific findings, such as quantifiable changes in stream morphology or water quality metrics. 3. Implications of the Findings: Include a brief statement on the broader implications of the research. For example, mention how the findings could inform environmental management practices or policy recommendations. 4. Clarification of Terms: Ensure that technical terms are defined or clarified, particularly for readers who may not be familiar with the specific terminology related to riverbank erosion and stream morphology. <p>By addressing these points, the abstract can provide a clearer and more comprehensive snapshot of the study, making it more accessible and informative for a wider audience.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript "Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria" are generally appropriate, but there are areas for improvement.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Section Headings: The manuscript should utilize clear and consistent section headings to demarcate different parts of the study, such as Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. This will enhance the organization and flow of the manuscript, making it easier for readers to navigate. 2. Subsection Organization: Within the Methodology section, subsections such as "Study Area," "Sample Analysis," and "Flow Dynamics" are useful. However, consider further breaking down these subsections into more specific categories if applicable, such as "Data Collection" and "Data Analysis," to provide clarity on the processes used. 3. Results Presentation: The Results section should be structured to present findings in a logical order, possibly starting with descriptive statistics followed by inferential statistics. This will help readers understand the progression of the analysis. 4. Discussion and Conclusion: The Discussion section should explicitly connect the findings back to the research questions posed in the Introduction. Additionally, the Conclusion should summarize the key findings and suggest practical implications or areas for future research. <p>By implementing these structural enhancements, the manuscript can achieve a clearer and more coherent presentation of the research, ultimately improving its impact and readability within the scientific community.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Scientific Correctness and Technical Soundness</p> <p>The manuscript "Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria" demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness through its robust methodology and comprehensive analysis. The study employs well-established techniques such as bathymetry surveys, flow dynamics measurements, and field</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>observations to assess the impact of riverbank erosion on stream morphology. The authors clearly define the study area, sampling locations, and data collection procedures, ensuring the reproducibility of the research.</p> <p>The presentation of results, particularly in tabular form, allows for easy interpretation and comparison of depth profiles at different stream locations during wet and dry seasons. The discussion of findings in the context of existing literature, such as the impacts of dredging, precipitation, and anthropogenic activities on stream morphology, further strengthens the scientific validity of the study.</p> <p>The research highlights the need for regulatory measures to control erosion-inducing factors and emphasizes the importance of bank erosion prevention programs. This practical application of the findings demonstrates the technical soundness of the manuscript and its potential to inform environmental management strategies.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript "Evaluating the Impact of River Bank Erosion on Environmental Stream Morphology for the Mini Piti Stream, Obio-Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria" appear to be a mix of recent and older sources. While some references are relevant and provide a solid foundation for the research, the inclusion of more recent studies would enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of Recent Studies: It is advisable to incorporate more recent literature (from the last 5 years) that discusses riverbank erosion, stream morphology, and related environmental impacts. This will ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest findings and methodologies in the field. Diversity of Sources: Consider adding references from a broader range of journals and sources, including those that focus specifically on environmental management, hydrology, and climate change impacts on river systems. This will provide a more comprehensive view of the topic. Key References to Consider: Here are a few recent studies that could be beneficial to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Riverbank erosion: A review of the impacts and management strategies" (2022) - This paper discusses various management strategies for riverbank erosion. - "The role of vegetation in stabilizing riverbanks: A review" (2023) - This article highlights the importance of vegetation in preventing erosion, which could be relevant to the findings of this study. - "Impacts of climate change on riverbank erosion and sediment transport" (2021) - This research addresses how climate change is affecting river systems, which is pertinent to the context of the study. <p>By updating the references to include more recent and diverse studies, the manuscript will not only strengthen its scientific foundation but also enhance its relevance to current environmental challenges and management practices.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Language and Grammar: Review the manuscript for grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. For instance, some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for better clarity. Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the paper. For example, the terms "bank erosion" and "riverbank erosion" should be used consistently to avoid confusion.</p> <p>2. References: Ensure that all references are formatted according to the journal's guidelines. Additionally, consider including more recent studies to provide a more comprehensive background.</p> <p>3. Figures and Tables: Ensure that all figures and tables are of high quality and properly labelled. Include captions that clearly explain what each figure or table represents.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are a few optional general comments that could be included in the review:</p> <p>1. Potential for Further Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript presents a solid foundation for further research on the impacts of riverbank erosion on stream morphology. Consider suggesting potential areas for future studies, such as: - Investigating the long-term effects of erosion on stream ecology and biodiversity - Comparing the findings with other streams in the region to identify common patterns and challenges - Exploring the effectiveness of various erosion control measures and their applicability in the study area <p>2. Practical Implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlight the practical implications of the research findings for local communities and environmental management agencies. Emphasize how the study can inform decision-making processes and contribute to the development of effective policies and strategies for riverbank erosion control and stream restoration. <p>3. Significance of the Study Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlight the significance of the Mini Piti Stream and its surrounding communities in the context of the region. Discuss how the findings of this study can be extrapolated to similar streams or applied to address broader environmental challenges in the area. <p>These general comments can provide additional insights and suggestions for the authors to consider in strengthening the manuscript and its potential impact within the scientific community.</p> <p>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific Robustness: The manuscript demonstrates a solid scientific foundation with appropriate methodology and data analysis, which supports the findings presented. The research addresses an important environmental issue, making it relevant to the field. - Minor Revisions Needed: While the manuscript is generally well-structured and informative, it requires minor revisions to enhance clarity, particularly in the abstract and the organization of sections. Improvements in the presentation of results and the inclusion of more recent references would further strengthen the manuscript. - Potential for Impact: The findings have significant implications for environmental management and policy, particularly regarding riverbank erosion control. The authors should emphasize these implications more clearly in the discussion and conclusion sections. <p>Overall, with minor revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the scientific community</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Aditi Majumdar
Department, University & Country	Birla Institute of Technology, India