

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_96804
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics in Surface and Groundwater Irrigation Systems across Districts of Andhra Pradesh, India: An Economic Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Under the materials and methods, the equations 1 and 2 are not discussed properly. What are these equations for? Clarify it properly. 2. The quality of most of the pictures (or graphs) provided in figures are not good. Replace those pictures with good quality wherever required. 3. Under the conclusion, there is a repetition of many of the sentences with the other parts of the paper. It should be avoided. 4. Economic analysis has not been discussed anywhere in the paper. Which type of irrigation is more economical? These points should be properly discussed and be included properly. 5. The references have not been written in a proper format. Write the references in uniform pattern and proper format. Author(s) should go through the guidelines of the journal for writing the references. 6. Many of the references used in the paper have not been included under the references part. All the references must be listed properly. 7. Author(s) should go through the guidelines of the journal for writing the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is not so good and grammatically needs to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunil Kumar
Department, University & Country	Banda University of Agriculture and Technology, India