SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_51434**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Rainwater harvesting - a safety net for water security in Ghana**
Type of the Article	**Review 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)

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	An interesting paper to inform policy makers, opinion leaders, stakeholders and the public about the importance of rainwater harvesting and integrated water resource management in the midst of climate change. The paper gives results for the country Ghana only general discussions on issues. There are adequate number and quality of references.	Thanks
Minor REVISION comments	The overall idea is fine. The topic of this paper is relevant, timely, and of interest to the audience of this journal. The abstract is very concise and sufficient. It should be described more precisely how authors proceed for to finding support and significance effect of different measures in Ghana for rain water harvesting and management. The supporting evidence in this paper is reliable. The results are interpreted wihout helping of tables, graphs, etc. and for this reason conclusions are not so sound.	The paper is designed to create awareness of the importance of rainwater harvesting and thus not concerned with the technical and economic aspect of the rainwater harvesting. Further studies will address that. Tables and graphs were absence because the paper is just a review and not a researched article.
Optional/General comments	For results and discussion are used only verbal statement of known facts. It´ll be useful describe how the methodology should be used in real cases. Figures and tables missing at all. The paper is easy to read, I did not seen grammatical errors.	As above.

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	