



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14046
Title of the Manuscript:	AN UNRESOLVABLE PARADIGM -TOO MUCH WATER – LIMITED WATER SUPPLIES? A SOUTH FLORIDA CONUNDRUM
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	The paper is addressing an interesting topic which I find however there is no correlation between the tittle and its objectives, methodology, results and conclusions. The objectives, methodology, results and conclusion are not reflective to the tittle of the study. No clear description of sources of water supply available at the study area and how are they affected by too much water?. What are the trends of water supply and demands in the study area?. The paper fails to address on how does solving the problem of too much water improve upon water supply?. Does not explain clearly why issues of too much water-limited water supply are unresolvable and what should be done?. The proposed solutions in table 1, 2 are not clearly explaining how the solutions can improve water supply. No literatures reviewed to support the ideas. Methodology Unclear Does not explain how key issues in this study "An Unresolvable Paradigm -Too Much Water – Limited Water Supplies? A South Florida Conundrum" are resolvable or unresolvable?. What are measurable indicators of the study? Results Unclear, does not represent the study as its tittle reflects Conclusion Unclear Does not give a conclusive remark of the study. In general the paper does not really present the practical solutions as it suggests in its tittle.	Thank you I have reorganized per your suggestion Too much water = flooding Added See revisions Table 2 deleted. I addressed T 1 some See title change and revisions See above Conclusion rewritten to match title



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References References are not properly cited, and inconsistently presented. There is however good results shown in figure 1, 2, 3 and 4a-d. These figures if well analysed and presented with some minor modifications of the objectives, methodology and results can be used to make a manuscript with a title which is reflective to the objectives, methodology and results. It is also important that abstract, introduction and conclusion are modified to reflect the title.	All references revised format and numbered I hope I have addressed this comment. Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	No header row in table 2 The range of Dates shown in the caption of Figure 2 does not correspond to the dates in horizontal axis. Figure 4 not properly labelled Acronyms are not explained to give a meaningful insight to the reader	Fig 2 revised Fig 4 , not 5 revised title
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		