



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_22146
Title of the Manuscript:	The Importance of Individual and Territorial Differences on Water Footprint Calculations
Type of the 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	<p>1) The English language of the manuscript should be deeply reviewed. The written English must be carefully revised in order to improve understanding the data and results of the manuscript.</p> <p>2) Title: Authors must specify the area covered (the region) in this study.</p> <p>3) Introduction: at the end of the introduction, the authors point out the lack of studies in Turkey and justify this lack of information. But the authors deal with different countries. Why this emphasis was only on Turkey? What is the main motivation of this study.</p> <p>4) What was the hypothesis of this study? and the objectives?</p> <p>5) Materials and Methods: There is a major flaw in the description section of the study method.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The division of the manuscript in chapters is not adequate in this type of publication. • The authors explain redundantly the categories of questions (29 questions). • How was the disclosure of this questionnaire for the target audience? • How was the questions were designed? • How was the divulgation of the proposed questionnaire in the internet? • How authors had access to these data? 	<p>1) English was checked and manuscript has been read and reviewed by a native English speaker</p> <p>2) About the study area was given an additional paragraph at page 2.</p> <p>3) For this purpose, they added a paragraph at the end of the introduction at page 2.</p> <p>4) The paragraph was added to page 3 for identified objectives.</p> <p>5) Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In lights of all comments, it was edited again. • The categories and design of questions were mentioned in the first and second paragraph of Material and Methods, Page 3. • The second paragraph of the Material-Metod were mentioned about data.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the sample universe? • Where these questions were virtually stored? • There was statistical analysis? • The Bray-Curtis similarity index are showed in Figure 5, but it was not described in the materials and methods section. • This study is not a revision, thus the methodology must follow the scientific methods. <p>6) Discussion: Specific data on the economics of each country must be add to the discussion. For example: what is the income level of each country. What type of crop is developed? What is the percentage of the agriculture and industrial activity in the income level?</p> <p>7) Conclusions: no citation is allowed in this sections. Authors must response directly to the specific objectives of the study. It seems like a discussion. What was the main contribution of the data analyzed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject that the questions were virtually stored was discussed in the first paragraph of Material Methods. • The paragraph about statistical analysis were added to Page 4. • The paragraph about the Bray-Curtis similarity index was added to page 4. • WFC tool is described in the Water Footprint Assessment Manual and this is scientific method. This information was added to the first paragraph of Material-Methods. <p>6) The results and discussion edited entirely and the results were interpreted with literature. Despite the serious literature, there are no similar studies to make comparisons. Specific data on the economics of each country were mentioned in the second and third of page 8.</p> <p>7) Conclusion section was rewritten with the reviewer's comments and suggestion ☺</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		