



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMCS_17200
Title of the Manuscript:	Reservoir network modelling with alternative reservoir and sediment considerations
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I would be happy to recommend this article for publication after authors address the following issues: 1/ In abstract you should properly explain the purpose of this study and what new findings (or theoretical novelty) this study offers. 2/ Since not all readers are deeply familiar with the presented theory, theoretical model given in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2) should be properly explained. 3/ Please provide a detailed description of all variables and parameters used in all equations, so the mathematical model is clear. You should also explain the meaning of particular components, especially in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2). Btw, is this equation notation, i.e. (1.1), (1.2), ..., adequate? 4/ There is a number of misprints and grammatical mistakes. Please check all text thoughtfully. I just identified some mistakes below.	1. Abstracts has been review and rewritten 2. Description of eq(1) and (2) has been explain and details can be seen in lines 67-71 in addition to table1 in line 33 3. Item 2 above has covered comment 3
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please extend abstract describing more clearly the purpose of this article. Avoid using reference to literature in Abstract. Page 1, line 37: "the formal": ? should be "the former" Page 1, line 40: Correct: "The combine effects of increase..."	1. The formal in line37 has been changed to the former in line 37 2. The line 40 has been corrected in lines 40-43
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		