

mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#search/CEJ/FMfcgzGqRPwMbwnnBsSvxxNICwwdvbh

Gmail CEJ

8 dari 13

changes in the hope that the feedback will be useful to you as you update the paper.

- 1- The authors should ask the help of native English speaking proof reader, because there are some typo and linguistic mistakes that should be fixed.
- 2- More suitable and general title should be selected for the article. "The Karangmumus" should be deleted from the title. Title should contain 10-12 words.
- 3- The introduction is poorly written and it does not properly refer to previously published studies. The authors need to carefully review the published literature, identify the gaps in the literature, and propose their approach to fill the gap.
- 4- Draw a flowchart from your workflow that briefly shows the process of the methodology.
- 5- Literature review is not enough. It is important to add some recent work (2018-2022) to the literature review. At least 7 new references should be added to article.
- 6- The exact location of the study area should be presented in a map. It is suggested to show the general view of the study area to detail (Country, city ...).
- 7- The quality of all figures is weak. The original (editable) source of the figures 9 and 10 should be used in the manuscript.
- 8- Much more explanations and interpretations should be added for the result, which are not enough.
- 9- It is suggested to compare the results of the present study with previous studies and analyze their results completely.

mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#search/CEJ/FMfcgzGqRPwMbwnnBsSvxxNICwwdvbh

Gmail CEJ

8 dari 13

Reviewer #3:



The article is well established and also authors present valuable results. In my idea it could be published with major revision. Authors should add more interpretations for the results. Some comments which could be help to improve the article are presented.

Comment 1: At this stage, the manuscript English language must not bear any error.

Comment 2: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 3: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 4: Page 5: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:  
"Furthermore, the soil type map is cut, taken according to the research and then the file format is changed from a raster file to an advanced processing file. Then the file is overlaid with a land use map for the purposes of calculating the number of curves. The topsoil in the Karangmumus watershed tends to be divided into 3 textures, namely coarse, medium and fine with the distribution as shown in Figure 5. It should be noted that the land use map contributes to the occurrence of surface runoff and topsoil





Revision :

Riviewer -1

No	Reviewer notes	Notes
1	The authors should ask the help of native English speaking proof reader, because there are some typo and linguistic mistakes that should be fixed.	Already done
2	More suitable and general title should be selected for the article. "The Karangmumus" should be deleted from the title. Title should contain 10-12 words.	Already delete
3	The introduction is poorly written and it does not properly refer to previously published studies. The authors need to carefully review the published literature, identify the gaps in the literature, and propose their approach to fill the gap.	The gap approach has been carried out (page-2)
4	Draw a flowchart from your workflow that briefly shows the process of the methodology.	Already done (page 5)
5	Literature review is not enough. It is important to add some recent work (2018-2022) to the literature review. At least 7 new references should be added to article.	Already done (page 12-13)
6	The exact location of the study area should be presented in a map. It is suggested to show the general view of the study area to detail (Country,city ...)	Already done (page 3-4)
7	The quality of all figures is weak. The original (editable) source of the figures 9 and 10 should be used in the manuscript.	Already done
8	Much more explanations and interpretations should be added for the result, which are not enough.	Already done (page 10-12)
9	It is suggested to compare the results of the present study with previous studies and analyze their results completely.	Already done (page 6-12)

Riviewer -3

No	Reviewer notes	Notes
1	At this stage, the manuscript English language must not bear any error.	Already done
2	Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument. please reorganize that:	Already done (page 1-3)
3	The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.	Already done
4	Page 5: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:	Already done



**office@civilejournal.org**  
kepada saya

Rab, 11 Jan, 21:31

Dear Dr. Rizal,

Thank you for the email.  
The indexing process by the Scopus need more time. And there is no specific timeline for it.  
You should wait for it.

...

Regards,  
Office C.E.J  
Civil Engineering Journal