



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_20526
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Cyclone PAM on Rainwater Harvesting Prospects in the Pacific region
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The text should be reviewed for its English, which is partly difficult to understand. This text needs serious major review before it is ready for publishing. The method chapter should clearly describe how damage to the rainwater harvesting systems was assessed, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The results chapter should provide more detailed data: - Clear descriptions of the rainwater harvesting systems examined - Numbers as to their distribution in the area investigated - Number of systems examined, possibly per area - Description of the damages observed and numbers about which systems were affected to which extend... The degree of damage should somehow be related to system type, type of supporting structures of the rainwater systems and possibly wind speed, if it was not the same in the entire area, plus exposure to wind. The discussion should comment on the degree of	The complete text was revised to improve the presentation and in English. The methodology was reviewed for the clear statements in the way of impact assessment. Description of the systems was given in detail. The surveyed number in the area was given in the form of the damage being recorded. This part seems to be difficult at the present moment as the survey was finished. A through description of the systems either in parts, roofs or other were given as and where possible. The possible reasons for the damage was



SDI Review Form 1.6

	damage of the different systems described and the reasons for differences. Finally the conclusion could come up with recommendations for further harvesting structures more likely to withstand future cyclones and give clear recommendations for structural and material aspects.	mentioned and also presented by the area wise. This was done with the names of the areas and also the type of damage recorded at those areas along with extent of damage. The recommendations part was redrafted for the suggestions to be followed for the harvesting systems which would withstand future impacts.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		