



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_36623
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of a Rainwater harvesting system in University College Hospital, Nigeria using RainCycle 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>)

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	No.1. I am not satisfied with the title "Performance of a Rainwater harvesting system in University College Hospital, Nigeria using RainCycle Model". Choose a suitable title. No.2. See the attached plagiarism report and rewrite the plagiarised parts. No.3. Keywords like Nigeria, hospital block, should be replaced with any other suitable keywords. No.4. Figure 3. Calculating the plan area of a catchment (The figure is copied from an internet source). Draw manually a figure of house with rooftop and scan the picture and paste it. Take a full/complete picture/photograph of Otunba-tunwase Children out-patient ward and should be numbered as Figure No.1 and take/shift it to study area (study area should be numbered as 2.). No need to mention the source of the figure as field work at University College Hospital, Ibadan. No.5. Abbreviated symbols are not linked with the text equations. No.6. Sources and operations are taken from Roebuck & Ashley 2006. Research methodology is lagging its own scientific and technical view for formulating the reservoir tank size. No.7. Only simulation is done by considering the source of Roebuck & Ashley 2006 and the final results are accounted. No.8. Research is lagging suitability of technical implementation on the basis of comparative study with other water harvesting models. No.9. Payback period of the investment for RWHS is 1year, but nowhere in the paper this calculation is shown. No.10. Roebuck & Ashley 2006 is missing in the Reference part. For references author/s should follow the pattern of the journal.	1. The topic has been revised to: "Assessing the Efficiency of a Rainwater harvesting system for meeting water demand in Ibadan: Case study of an Hospital" 2. The plagiarized parts have been re-written 3. Keywords has been changed to: rainwater harvesting, water saving efficiency, payback period 4. Manual picture of the catchment plan has been drawn (figure 4) A full picture of the ward has been placed in the study area. 5. Abbreviations has been linked to the equations 6. Research methodology has been revised (section 3.1 to 3.3) 7. This has been amended 8. Comparison with other water harvesting models has been reported 9. Payback period is presented in section 3.3 10. This has been added to the reference section
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		