

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-50622

Date: 13/3/2025

Title: River Management and Restoration: A Strategic Approach Esha Yadav

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision√.....
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: Ahmed M. Saqr

Date: 13/3/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

The manuscript addresses the critical issue of river management and restoration, highlighting various ecological restoration technologies and their potential benefits. It underscores the importance of maintaining biodiversity, water quality, and sustainable river ecosystems. While the topic is relevant and timely, the paper would benefit from stronger empirical analysis, methodological clarity, and a more critical engagement with existing literature to enhance its scientific contribution.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Abstract Weakness:

The abstract lacks a clear statement of objectives, methods used, key findings, and implications, providing only general statements without clearly specifying the unique contributions of the research presented

.

Weak Introduction:

The introduction is overly general and lacks clear objectives or research questions, failing to adequately justify the significance and originality of the study within the existing literature

.

Insufficient Literature Review:

References are outdated, inadequately cover recent advancements, and the review lacks critical analysis and synthesis, limiting the manuscript's academic depth and contextual relevance to current trends

.

Lack of Clear Methodology:

Methods described are generic, lacking detailed information on study locations, criteria for method selection, and specific methodologies employed, making it difficult to evaluate the replicability of the research

.

Poor Methodological Justification:

The manuscript does not sufficiently explain why certain restoration techniques were selected over alternatives, resulting in weak methodological grounding and insufficient justification of the chosen approaches

.

Absence of Empirical Data and Analysis:

The paper lacks empirical data collection or original analytical work. It appears more as a review rather than original research, diminishing its value as a primary research article

.

Limited Critical Analysis of Results:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The analysis section superficially describes restoration technologies without providing robust data, statistical validation, or case study examples that would substantiate the efficacy or application of these technologies

.

Unclear and Inadequate Figures/Tables:

Figures and tables provided (such as Table-1) are too simplistic, lack analytical depth, and fail to illustrate complex relationships or comparative insights effectively, thus reducing the value of visual elements to enhance reader understanding

.

Generalized Conclusions:

The conclusions presented are generalized, lack precise implications for policy or management practices, and fail to deliver a nuanced interpretation of results in light of broader environmental and socio-economic contexts

.

Lack of Discussion on Limitations and Future Work:

The manuscript does not acknowledge study limitations, uncertainties, or potential barriers in applying discussed restoration technologies, and fails to suggest meaningful future research directions

.

Structural and Formatting Issues:

Several formatting inconsistencies, grammatical errors, and unclear sentence structures negatively affect readability and overall professional presentation of the manuscript, indicating inadequate editorial rigor

.

Over-reliance on Secondary Sources:

The manuscript excessively relies on secondary sources without original empirical data, critical analysis, or novel theoretical contributions, which significantly diminishes the overall academic contribution to the field

.