



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24815
Title of the Manuscript:	BASC AND TECHNICAL CONSIDERATION ON POND DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>I should strongly suggest that the author include the steps involved in construction of ponds for the paper to make meaningful contribution the scientific fraternity. In that way other researchers will find the paper useful as they will be using it to construct ponds or as teaching/ training material.</p> <p>Ponds can also be in different types depending on use . Describe that in the manuscript.</p>	<p>Corrected: See pages (314 – 407)</p> <p>See pages (182 – 196)</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The conclusion is not reflective of what the whole documents is talking about. In conclusion you simply summarise what has been discussed , something this manuscript has not done. Re write the conclusion as a nut shell of the whole document not bringing other issues outside the context.</p>	<p>Modified (see pages 410- 420)</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		