



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	1. The Title is too journalistic. A clear indication of what the key problem to be solved is preferred. 2. The abstract is to define problems, methodology to solve the problem and results. The abstract should be re-written with key words 3. Most of the write-up under methodology could have been discussed under literature. Real methodology started in line 98 and stopped at line 107. There are result discussions in this section that is not appropriate. E.g . line 107 4. Figures are not shown and should always be placed before discussion 5. The findings should be written succinctly 6. The conclusion should address contribution to knowledge and possible recommendations 7. The references should be written well for example, you can not list more than ten people in a reference	Title revised Abstract revised Key words added Revision made. Thank you I agree Figures at end – I assume publisher will move them. With regard to placement, I respectfully disagree. All other paper and books I have done are the opposite. Discussion, then figured See revisions Revised – good comment Reference format revised. Numbered. I respectfully disagree that you cannot have more than 10 authors. I have several papers/report with same. And this is the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		reference.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		