

Manuscript: “**Estimation Of Runoff And Erosion Rates Using Agwa - Kineros2 Model: Application To A Mediterranean Watershed**”

Submitted: 23 October 2020

Accepted: 14 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: El Harche Sanae

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p193

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelkader EL Garouani,
Morocco

Reviewer 2: M’bouka Milandou Idriss,
Marien Ngouabi University, Congo

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	

Date Manuscript Received: 02/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/11/2020
Manuscript Title: ESTIMATION OF RUNOFF AND EROSION RATES USING AGWA - KINEROS2 MODEL: APPLICATION TO A MEDITERRANEAN WATERSHED	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.11.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
<i>Some parts, especially the introduction, do not reflect the title of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>The abstract is clear, but it must be improved</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>I don't see grammatical errors, but I found some sentences too long and this is not good in science.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The method is good, but it tends to explain too much about the model used. While the authors should be brief in explaining the model and then say why it was chosen for this study...</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>The results are appreciable</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Nothing bad to report</i>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Nothing bad to report</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the presentation of the methodology, be precise and objective. There is no point in giving a long definition of the model in the methodology, it tires the reader. It is an article and not a book or a dissertation.

In the introduction, always highlight the sensitivity or resistance of the environment (soil, precipitation, etc.) in relation to the two parameters studied (runoff and erosion).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is good, all that is needed is for the authors to improve it slightly. The methodology used is topical for these kinds of studies in geomorphology.