



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_44216
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND GANGES DISACHARGE ON THE SALINITY OF THE PASSUR RIVER, SOUTHWESTERN BANGLADESH
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It's a good article explaining the salinity problem in south-western Bangladesh. Some editing and correction will make the article more interesting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I recommend rechecking the legends in figure 3.4.1 on page 8. There is a discrepancy between description and the figure. It seems salinity decreasing and rainfall increasing over time. Equation is different in figure and description (intercept is 1964 in figure, but 1924 in text). I suggest checking other figures whether there is any discrepancy between the figures and their descriptions.</li> <li>2) In regression analyses it is necessary to include F-values and p-values to understand the significance of analyses.</li> <li>3) R-squared values indicate the percentage of variation in dependent variable can be explained by independent variables. R-squared value of 0.128 (page-8, line-157) should never interpreted as near zero and it is not a strong mean to explain correlation. Author(s) can add some bivariate correlation analyses to substantiate the claims.</li> <li>4) The interpretation and reporting of R-squared should follow a standard guideline, such as APA or Chicago style.</li> <li>5) Author(s) used multiple referencing styles in the article. Sometimes [35], sometimes (Huq and Ayers; 2008). There is a problem with in-text referencing styles throughout the article. One standard reference style should be followed throughout the article.</li> <li>6) Figure 2.1: Authors mention [source: website] without mentioning the name of the website. It would be better to provide a reference number [n], and providing the details in reference. I recommend the same for other figures.</li> <li>7) It is better not to use "our country", "our ecosystem", just mention Bangladesh or the ecosystem of Bangladesh.</li> <li>8) Final objective of the study is to find out solutions. Author only mentioned about GHG emissions from Bangladesh which is insignificant. As many rivers in Bangladesh entered from neighbouring country, author can also make some policy recommendation about Trans Boundary river strategies, and global action for GHG reduction, public awareness building, advocacy with intergovernmental structures etc.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, it was my mistake. I've corrected it and there is no other discrepancy.</li> <li>2. I've added P and F value.</li> <li>3. I had some misconception about R and R<sup>2</sup>. It is okay now. And I've also used Pearson correlation in this case.</li> <li>4. P, F and R values have been written in APA style.</li> <li>5. Now all the references are in the same style.</li> <li>6. It's done.</li> <li>7. Corrected.</li> <li>8. I have added some lines in the conclusion section about these topics.</li> </ol>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<div>1) Authors used many online sources. As online sources are susceptible to change it is better to include retrieve dates; for example, Oxfam. (2010). Gender, disaster risk reduction, and climate change adaptation: A learning companion. Retrieved March 04, 2013, from <a href="http://www.gdonline.org/resources/OxfamGender&amp;ARR.pdf">http://www.gdonline.org/resources/OxfamGender&amp;ARR.pdf</a></div> <div>2) Line 42: we never mention Dr./Prof. etc. in citation.</div> <div>3) There are some grammatical errors. Editing the article will surely improve it.</div> <div>4) Page 10, line 195 &amp; line226: “x” is missing from the equation.</div> <div>5) First line of the introduction: is “National Geographic” a citation? Authors need to clarify it.</div> <div>6) In conclusion “climatic disaster” should be replaced by “natural disaster”</div>	<div>1. Done.</div> <div>2. Done</div> <div>3. I have tried to improve.</div> <div>4. It's okay now.</div> <div>5. Yes, it's a citation and I have cleared it using reference number.</div> <div>6. Done</div>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	Thanks for your review comment. I've got a chance to improve my manuscript and gain knowledge. I was no good at statistical analysis and that's why I made mistakes. However, I am a beginner and I've tried my best.  N.B., I've highlighted the corrected parts where possible.