

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_115749
Title of the Manuscript:	Rooftop Rainwater Harvesting: A Solution to Urban Water Scarcity
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is considered adequate, since it shows the what and the how, although it could be improved, since the title should preferably mention the what, how, with whom and where, for example: Rainwater harvesting from rooftops, a proposed solution to water scarcity in cities: case Shrigonda Town.</p> <p>The summary presented is understandable and shows what was done in the study.</p> <p>The structure and content of the subsections are adequate, since it shows what is relevant to the study, but there are errors of form, for example: In the title and subtitles, high and low mixes, it should be unified, in addition it is shown that it does not adequately define the acronyms, since it shows tables with acronyms without first showing the meaning, it is important to take care of fonts, so that the work is uniform, professional and at the same time elegant scientifically speaking.</p> <p>The article shows that it is written correctly, presents the calculation method correctly, presents formulas and summarizes its findings, but the way in which it presents the methodology is not the most appropriate, since it is not making a poster for dissemination, it should describe and present each stage. In the other sections there is coherence between what he presents and his results. The objectives always begin with a verb in the infinitive, which indicates what you want to do, and for what, the objective presented seems more like a report than an objective, since it must be measurable, verifiable and achievable, this point is extremely important.</p> <p>As for the references, they are presented and considered adequate, but there are references that are not cited in the article, possibly they were used for the final work, but it is important to remind you that what is cited is referenced, and what should be referenced. aforementioned. If it is not found in the document, it is not correct that they appear, it is considered important to correct this error, since this provides confidence in the author, so that he not only placed references to see this section complete, but that they were read, analyzed and They were discriminated against because they were considered important for the job in question.</p> <p>The work is mostly good, but it has errors that should be considered to be corrected, otherwise the veracity and importance of the work will be questioned, the format should be impeccable in its presentation, the uniform content, for example the tables should be standardized, in addition to taking great care of the references, which are really cited in the document to be presented and evaluated.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English presented is considered to be academically understandable, well structured.	
Optional/General comments	It would be very important to measure in real time a year of rainfall and the levels obtained, since they manage historical data, but it is important to consider the changes that are generated by the changes in the rainfall.	

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:	Rosa María de Anda López
Department, University & Country	Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Valle de Bravo, México