SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_30033**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Field Experiments on Hydraulic Jump in a Sloped Triangular Channel**
Type of the 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The literature review has to be revised since some latest journal paper is not included in the manuscript. 2. The experimental facilities used in the measurements have to be introduced and the precisions of measurements have to be testified. 3. In page 4, the authors indicate that their model and Debabeche model are equally better than the model of Rashwan. The Debabeche model and Rashwan model has to be introduced. And the three models have to be compared in a discussion section.	Limited number of researchers deals with triangular channel lines 52 – 57 Lines 51 – 67 Showed in lines 46 – 50 and the two authors improved theoretical models which were compared with the present study. Rashwan used horizontal bed and Debabeche used only four slopes.
Minor REVISION comments	There some spelling mistakes and grammatical errors in the manuscript. The authors need to revise the manuscript carefully.	Done
Optional/General comments	The manuscript at present reads more like a conference paper. While I believe the study provides a significant contribution, the writing does not do it justice in places. The methods lack necessary detail, and a discussion section should be added.	Done lines 85 - 119