

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_121343
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Sponge City for Controlling Surface Runoff Pollution
Type of the Article	Review 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 study shows relevant information about flooding in cities. Flooding causes countless inconveniences and damage to cities, regardless of their size. The article presents a clear text, providing detailed information about sponge cities and contributions for managers. In the face of climate change, the strategies applied in sponge cities are viable and allow flooding to be addressed. Furthermore, it encourages the development of studies addressing the aspects presented in sponge cities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and adequate to the focus of the manuscript.	
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.	I suggest adding the main objective and method used to this review. An adequate ABSTRACT must give general information, followed by the main objective, methodology applied, results and discussion, and finally, the conclusion with the answer to the objective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, some adjustments are marked in the text.	
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.	I believe that some adjustments can be made without prejudice to the contribution of this article. In general, all can easily make.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think that the references are adequate and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I made some suggestions in the text to improve comprehension.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Rejane Magalhães de Mendonça Pimentel
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Brasil