



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_26688
Title of the Manuscript:	A three-dimensional statistical model of karst flow conduits
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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This paper is focused on developing a three-dimensional statistical model of karst flow conduits. In this context, the author(s) provide a report on their development applications regarding to the model. From a general perspective, the paper comes with a remarkable subject. But before it can be published at the JGEESI, some minor revisions should also be done. The related revisions are:</p> <p>1- The Abstract may be a little shortened by discussing about background, objective of the work and the obtained results.</p> <p>2- Organization of the titles should be like this: 1. is for the main title; and 1.1., 1.2., 1.3...etc. are for its sub-titles.</p> <p>3- There are blanks after main titles and before the first sub-titles. It will be better to provide some brief sentences explaining the content; in order to improve readability and ensure a good content organization.</p> <p>4- Number of total references is OK. But in order to keep the content up-to-date, there should be a few more references from 2015, and 2016.</p>	<p>I rewrote the abstract in order to take in account this important remark. I strictly followed the proposed schedule "background" - "objective" - "obtained results" even if these three words don't explicitly appear in the new abstract.</p> <p>I agree with that, this renders things clearer.</p> <p>I added such sentences that are, to a certain extent, a kind of abstract or introduction of what follows. I hope this will render things clearer. I also hope this will not render the text too long or too heavy.</p> <p>I added six fresh references and, in order to take them in account, I slightly modified the introduction</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Thanks the author(s) for their valuable efforts to form this paper.	
Optional/General comments	-	