



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 BJMCS 1851
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Determination of Normal Operating Heights of Reservoirs in a Network Using Non-linear Reservoir Method</i>

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 10 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	The idea of the manuscript is interesting. However, we identified a need for improvements as follows. The introduction of work is reasonable, although the problem has not been properly set. For example, the phrase "...Routing is an analytical with rainfall runoff as the input ..." in lines 25 and 26, is wanting. We believe however that the biggest problem of the manuscript relates to the unclear formulation of the problem. Our understanding is very difficult due to lack of definitions in terms of indexing used in the equations. For example, row 98 refers to V_m used in equation of the line 97, not listed. However V_m is not used in the equation of line 97, suggesting confusion related to indexes. $v(\text{initial volume})$ in equation of line 97 is unclear once our interpretation of lines 95 and 96 suggests something like: total volume of reservoirs 1 to m-1 less or equal than volume of reservoir m. V is used with index (equation in line 97) and without index (equation 1). It is considered that, from Model Formulation, understanding the whole text has been	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	compromised. Thus, it is suggested that the manuscript is rejected and the authors encouraged submitting it again, after a thorough review.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer