

Review of: "Revitalizing Key Conditions and Integrated Watershed Management Approach to Sustain Water Availability and Agriculture in Semi-Arid Regions"

Nikola Jovanovic

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title:

The title is too long and does not completely cope with the whole paper. I recommend to revise, for example to "The Implementation of Integrated Watershed Management: Revitalizing Key Conditions in in Semi-Arid Regions"

Abstract:

Abstract structure is poor. There is no clear goal of the literature review, neither can reader conclude that this paper is a literature review until the end of introduction.

Introduction:

The first two sentences in the introduction part are quite long, consider revising. There are a couple of such sentences further in introduction part, consider revising where possible. The goal of the literature review at the end of introduction part is poorly explained. I recommend defining goals using bullet points and avoiding long and confusing sentences. Introduction should also contain what other review papers addressed regarding this topic.

Implementation of integrated watershed management (IWSM) – Please check if IWSM is suitable for this term.

There is no methodology part. Even though this is not always mandatory for review papers, it is not clear to readers how author approach to this literature review. Therefore, paper seems more like a perspective or opinion. This is further supported by only 16 references that this literature review has, which would make readers question the whole paper.

Section 2.2., fourth paragraph doesn't have a single reference – please revise.

The whole paper has a lot of too long sentences, please check the whole paper and revise where possible.

Section 3.2., second paragraph, please define problems more appropriately, for example via bullet points and reference appropriately.

Section 4.1.2. – First paragraph of this section seems like some kind of introduction and discusses things other than legal and policy support, which is sufficient. Go straight to the point of your section. Furthermore, last paragraph of this section, which is discussing practice in Israel, should also take into account the area of this country and standard. Even though the

author would like to implement it as a good example, there are reasons why this is not easily implementable in other countries and cases, which should be acknowledged.

Conclusion

First sentence – your focus is on arid regions, not worldwide countries.

Second sentence – Once again previous literature reviews are poorly addressed though whole paper.

Fourth sentence – Sounds more like a defining research goals than a conclusion.

In general, even though paper might have a several good ideas, the structure of it is poor. It may take a lot of effort and revision to reach the standard of a proper literature review paper, while transforming it to a perspective or opinion could be more reasonable. Paper needs to be enhanced with additional references other than just 16 currently used. There are plenty of research related to Integrated Watershed Management research.