



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPS_31098
Title of the Manuscript:	Categorization of Morphometric Surface Through Morphometric Diversity Analysis in Kushkarni River Basin of Eastern India
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	<p>The manuscript calculated various morphometric parameters to understand the different morphometric surface along Kushkarni river basin. Based on the parameters three models have been constructed, namely relief diversity model (RDM), drainage diversity model (DDM), morphometric diversity model (MDM). I have few suggestions/objections as follows:</p> <p>Why the following article is not incorporated in this study with explaining how the present study is differ from previous one?</p> <p>Khatun.S., Pal. S., 2016, Analysis of Regional Hypsometric Integral to Identify Landscape Evolution in Kushkarani River Basin. <i>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</i>6(3,: 1-17.</p> <p>It should be cited.</p> <p>For what basis the parameters are classified in 10 point scale for example the sinuosity values seems the maturity of river with sinuous–braided to meandering stage and values of bifurcation ratio indicting the highly dissected drainage basin and its variation depends on the geological and lithologic development of the basin as higher R_b indicates a strong structural control on the basin.</p> <p>Describes the theoretical significance of the article as you have tabulated the parameters in 12 tables without their proper description in text comparing the values.</p>	<p>It is incorporated.</p> <p>Few lines added for better clarification. But the example you have cited here is correct. But as the river is a pleateau fringe river with less geological diversity, it is assumed that sinuosity will increase in those areas where hydrological action is mightier than topographic control. To classify the continuum of topography to hydrologic control, this classification is made.</p> <p>Yes it is described in text.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Discussion and conclusion is very concise and title of the article is not achieved. How the area have been classified in terms of morphometric surface ? It should be mention in conclusion part. Section 4.1 should be elaborate with giving the values of calculated parameters.</p> <p>It is necessary to introduce a good description of all the calculated parameters in discussion section.</p> <p>Have any field evidence which support the SRTM based calculation. Should put information about field data as well as a clear description of the all the parameters. Without this step it is really difficult, to follow the text and the proposed conclusions.</p>	<p>It is included.</p> <p>Section 4.1 is developed with the quantitative values of the individual parameters Yes sir, we have tried to incorporate it.</p> <p>Some of the depressed part is checked in the downstream portion. Apart from field toposheet of the SOI is also consulted for checking the same</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>There are some typos and grammatically incorrect sentences throughout the manuscript. I have only pointed at some of them in my comments. Please make sure they are all fixed when you submit a revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>(1) Is it Kushkarani or Kushkarni river as in previously published article it seems Kushkarani. (2) Figure 1 upper part is not clear. So please enlarge the font size and elaborate the caption of the fig 1. (2) Table 4 HG or hg, it should be same throughout the text. (3) Previous article mentioned the total area of the basin is about 172 sq. km but here it is different. It should be check. (4) Table1: this is not description of parameters it is formulae (5) Table 2 is missing (6) In table 4 sub-classes are values or what? (7) References should uniformly formatted.</p> <p>Line 1 to 9: It should be shifted in introduction section from "Most of the previous work..... susceptible zones etc". Line 23: The sentence is hard to understand. Please rephrase Line 24: "A troop of scholar" avoid the use of such poetry word and simply write the "previous studies" and give the reference in last of the sentence. Line 25 : delete "in their studies" Line 25-26: "The parameters for this are" for what please correct the sentence as "The morphometric parameter calculated in the study are" Line 28-33: Rephrase the sentence Line 55: Correct the space in reference no 33 The numbering of sub heading should be check. For example: Line 177: Subheading 3.2. under heading no. 4 Line 201: Subheading 3.3. under heading no. 4 Line 225: subheading 3.4 under heading no. 4 Line 251: subheading 3.5 under heading no. 4</p>	<p>Both names are correct in our knowledge. We replaced the Kushkarni as Kushkarani.</p> <p>Figure 1 is modified</p> <p>HG is right which indicate the short form of Hydraulic Gradient.</p> <p>We have corrected the basin area.</p> <p>By mistake table numbers was incorrect. Now we have corrected table number. In table 4 (corrected no. 3) parameters are sub classes according to their value.</p> <p>All references are formatted uniformly.</p> <p>We rewrite the sentences</p> <p>Space is corrected</p> <p>Sub headings are checked and corrected</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		