



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_31225
Title of the Manuscript:	Conflict Resolution for Sacramento-San-Joaquin Delta with Stability and Sensitivity Analyses Using the Graph Model
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	- Abstract section should start with an introduction sentence (about the Graph model or DSS) -	- Reply: a description about the DSS is included in the Abstract as follow: "a Decision Support System (DSS) has been developed, incorporating multiple-criteria decision analysis, stability and equilibrium analysis, and uncertainty analysis using the info-gap technique".
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Line 56: the word (used) need to delete. - Line 175: the words (determined to be the) need to delete. - Line 220: These factors, (which factors ??) better to delete. - Line 221&222: the author explain perfectly the use of graph model for conflict resolution, and explain the other factors which may indirectly affect this conflict. So, better to delete the last sentence (line 221&222).	- Reply: Removed. - Reply: Deleted. - Reply: Deleted. It was a typo. - Reply: Removed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		