



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>)



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	Topic: the topic is good, however your choice location for study renders the study irrelevant as the cost of purification is more than that of sinking a borehole which is relatively cheap to sink in your study area as compared with northern Nigeria where water table is very low. secondly you were not able to establish that water demand out ways the supply of same as such the study is hanging and being carried out in isolation of the human component for which it is meant for. A questionnaire, survey may augment this. Abstract: please you have not included a major component of an abstract which is recommendation Introduction first paragraph: please state you source of information. Secondly not everywhere has water problem as some are have surplus. please indicate the spatial variation to make the paragraph relevant Second paragraph: the paragraph is shallow. you did not show any previous researches suggesting shortfall in water delivery by the water cooperation in Nigeria and your study location, why state your proposition? And more importantly there is no stated source of information. Last paragraph: the paragraph is spurious. Please i have a fair knowledge of the area in question and there is no established research to show the claim of water shortage in the area. i stand to be corrected with proofs Study area: What is the implication of your study area discuss for your study? Otherwise its irrelevant. Methodology is weak and source of data not stated. Results and discussion: this is not properly done. Result discussion is done in relation to the findings of other researches and you have not done that. References: If the journal uses APA style then you have not done the right thing. then you may have to consult 6th edition of the APA style of referencing. More importantly no local paper is referenced in connection with the subject matter. this is not acceptable.... there are several works on rain water harvesting even though they may not have used the same model as you did.	The water demand has been established in section 3.1.2 Recommendation has been included. Source of information is stated as [1] Source is stated as [2] Established research on water shortage in the area has been included [14] This has been discussed further in the paragraph. Methodology has been well addressed in sections 3.1 to 3.2. Results and discussion has been addressed. The journal did not use APA style, the referencing has been done in line with the journal's style recommended in the paper template. Local papers have been referenced [14, 16 & 25].
Minor REVISION comments	Please see the main text for this	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we follow VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>