



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_43941
Title of the Manuscript:	Excel Approach for Infiltration Capacity for Different Lands
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 <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	The parameter R^2 obtainable from Excel is the coefficient of determination, not the correlation coefficient of which it is the square There is needed a paragraph of caution, maybe in line 298, about the validity of the second degree polynomial expression. It only describes the experimental result well in an intermediate range of accumulated infiltration. At very low infiltrations it may be very erroneous, for instance the infiltration will be negative for cases A3 fig 5 and 1 fig .10. At very high infiltrations the equation will give an impossible declining cumulative infiltration with time, for instance down to one-half of the maximum at 37 minutes for case A3 fig 5, entailing risk of false interpretation at sparsely spaced readings and of equilibrium infiltration which is often the most interesting infiltration parameter. Errors from the reference 11 are uncritically carried over. The typical infiltration behaviour is to reach an equilibrium with a constant infiltration rate for instance given by Horton's term f_c. This was also the case for reference 11 but an error made in the calculation of its column 6 made it seen like infiltration stopped which is almost impossible. Tables 6-8 seem to show the differential filtration but the heading says accumulated. Change heading or change numbers to accumulated filtration. Reference 12 on which the tables are based gives tables that are very confusing (infiltrations, rates depths etc are not easily convertible)	Done – Lines 17, 113, 318 & 370 Done – Lines 342 - 350 Done – In table 4, Lines 153 & 154 Done – In tables 6, 7 & 8, Lines 175, 190 & 194
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Follow the instruction for authors in https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BzvkYtxLTJZjMzYwcTJwZ2g5ZFE/view	Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	For instance, • The font changes unsystematically and needs to be unified. • Follow the recommended reference formats (the used format is very different in many places). The link to ref 12 seems to be broken	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In view of the many errors the authors should thoroughly and critically review their source materials to eliminate similar errors	Done

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	