



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23935
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INTERFACE BETWEEN HYDROPOWER GENERATION AND OTHER WATER USES IN THE PIABANHA RIVER BASIN, BRAZIL
Type of the Article	Method 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article is interesting and results are also showing new for design purposes. Authors are required to write/ Change: TITLE: A Study of the Piabanha River Basin to Interface the Hydropower Generation and Other Uses of Water in Brazil Introduction: Gap of work need to be explained in brief in Abstract and in detailed in Introduction sections; what was the percentage utilisation of water earlier for which author now shows its utilisation 75% with this model optimally. 4 Results It is to be written as: 4. Results & Discussion 5. Conclusion It is to be written point wise.	The title and the results chapter title were changed. This article models the loss of power generation in different scenarios using the VMO according to the historical series of flows. There are no historical records of water withdraw at the study site. In this way, it was just possible to calculate the actual withdraw value in the river, 75%, which already suggests an approach to the maximum allowed value and a loss of power generation hydroelectric facility as pointed in the Conclusion. The conclusion was improved.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Article is considered to be good for publication with above minor revisions as suggested.	