



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 contents of the abstract did not follow the standard form. For most publications, the abstract should include the purpose of study, the methodology, findings and conclusions/recommendations.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Most of the works were incorrectly cited such as Jevrejeva, Moore and Grinsted, 2010, in line 27, which ought to be written as Jevrejeva, et al. 2. No specific format was followed in the Reference section. Some years of publication were in parenthesis while some were not. Moreover, in writing author's name, some names started with surnames while some started with initials. Example is line 339, J. Box instead of Box J. 3. OECD, 2008, cited in line 41 did not appear in the reference section.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nigeria