

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_97001
Title of the Manuscript:	The bio-geosystem strategy for sustainable irrigated agriculture in Africa.
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:

(<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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the article is of scientific importance since it takes natural aspects to solve real and current problems in agriculture in Africa. Yes, the title covers the topic explained in the article. Yes, the abstract mentions the importance of using the bio-geosystem strategy for agriculture in Africa. The information in the summary is coherent to fully understand the importance of the topic in the current agriculture. Yes, the theoretical framework used is appropriate to the topic, the structure of the information and match each section of the article. Yes, it is a good review article for bibliographic and reference purposes. Yes, although for a review article, it has few bibliographical references, most of them are recent. I recommend doing a better literature review. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the article is well written and suitable for scholarly communications. 	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Francisco Aguirre Cadena
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Chiapas, Mexico