

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125481
Title of the Manuscript:	Aggregation of Key Evaluation Indicators for Watershed Development Programmes
Type of the Article	

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 is significant for the scientific community, particularly for those involved in watershed management and environmental sustainability. It introduces a structured approach to selecting and aggregating key evaluation indicators, which are essential for assessing the effectiveness of watershed development programs. By focusing on indicators related to terrain management, water utilization, agronomic vitality, and socio-economic impacts, the manuscript offers a comprehensive framework for evaluating such programs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It should be more specific and engaging to highlight the importance of these indicators in assessing program success. A more refined title could be: "Evaluating Watershed Development: A Framework for Key Indicator Selection and Aggregation"	
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 effectively outlines the importance of selecting and aggregating evaluation indicators for watershed development programs. It introduces a structured approach, organizing indicators into key themes such as terrain management, water resource utilization, and socio-economic development. This framework ensures comprehensive evaluation and highlights the need for context-specific indicators to accurately assess program outcomes. The paper's approach aims to improve future program evaluations by offering valuable insights into sustainability and effectiveness. Overall, the abstract covers the essential points but could benefit from a more streamlined presentation	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally effective, offering a logical flow from the introduction to thematic sections on evaluation indicators for watershed development programs. The distinct subsections enhance clarity; however, adding a methods section to explain the framework for indicator selection would improve understanding. Reducing overlapping content and including a discussion on real-world applications could further enhance coherence and relevance.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, employing a structured approach to select and aggregate evaluation indicators for watershed development programs. It builds on established theories and previous research, ensuring a solid foundation for its framework. By including diverse indicators that cover biophysical, socio-economic, and sustainability aspects, it demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of watershed management complexities. The focus on context-specific indicators further enhances its relevance and applicability across different geographical and ecological conditions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</div>	<div>Recent Studies: Adding studies from the last five years would enhance relevance. For example:</div> <div><div><div></div><div>Recent Watershed Management Studies:</div></div><div><div>· Rogers, K. H., & S. J. B. (2021). "Adaptive management of watersheds: Integrating science and practice." <i>Water Resources Research</i>.</div><div>• Akhter, N., & J. A. A. (2022). "Watershed management strategies for climate resilience." <i>Journal of Hydrology</i>.</div></div><div><div>· Sustainability and Ecosystem Services:</div><div>· Meyer, S. S., & L. C. R. (2020). "Ecosystem services in watershed management: A review of approaches." <i>Ecosystem Services</i>.</div><div>• Lin, S., et al. (2019). "Sustainable watershed management and ecosystem services: A global perspective." <i>Sustainability</i>.</div></div><div><div>· Global Perspectives on Watershed Development:</div><div>· Ostrom, E., & A. K. G. (2022). "Governing the commons: Watershed management in a changing world." <i>International Journal of Water Governance</i>.</div><div>• Schmidt, K., & M. H. B. (2023). "Evaluating watershed management programs: Lessons learned from around the globe." <i>Water Policy</i>.</div></div><div>Incorporating these references would strengthen the manuscript by reflecting recent findings and diverse perspectives.</div></div>	
<div>Optional/General comments</div>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alem Tesfay Desalegn
Department, University & Country	Wachemo University, Ethiopia