



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

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

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: 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)
General comment:	The paper discuss the problem of determining the normal operating height of reservoirs in a network to satisfy hydraulic constraints and guarantee stability. The specific problem is of interest to the hydrological community and is solved using a straightforward mathematical approach. The main conclusion of the paper is that a non linear problem can be linearized and its stability can be evaluated based on the properties of the Jabian matrix. In the present form, the results presented seem to be not original enough to deserve publication. The Authors should make an extra effort to describe the physical problem better, paving the ground for the case-study they present at the end of the paper.	Corrected
Specific comments:	The Authors should improve the language throughout of the paper and correct some typos. The introduction can be shortened. Line 26: runoff is generally considered the output of a routing method Line 48-49: please clarify the sentence	corrected
Title and abstract	I suggest to modify Title and abstract to focus more on some original results to present.	Corrected The abstract has been reframe to suite the intent of the paper
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The problem is original but should be described also in a more physical way (a sketch of a network of reservoir with possible connections among them will help people from different areas to understand the problem). The results which can be obtained should be presented in a less mathematical way in order to show also non mathematicians which are the potentials of the modelling approach.	corrected
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Yes	
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)	A more physical perspective would improve the relevance of the work. The methodology is redundant in some parts. Give at least one reference for the similarity transformation (line 204)	corrected
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should	This section should be expanded to show the potentials of the method proposed for the resolution of the real hydraulic problem.	corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

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?)		
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	I do not know	
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)	Conclusions can be improved based on an extended analysis of results.	corrected
References	ok	

Note: The reviewers comment in the file SDI Review Form1.6 has been corrected but cannot be effected there because it is a pdf file