



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. I ask the authors to carefully check the numerical data presented in Table 1. Are there any arithmetical errors here, because according to the IRR and PP indicators, the considered measures are extremely profitable? At the same time, according to the BCR indicator, the effectiveness of these measures is significantly lower. Such results are theoretically possible, but look somewhat unusual.</p> <p>2. At the beginning of the introduction, it should be indicated that the relevant areas are located in India: "Rice production in the coastal districts of Kerala and particularly the low-lying areas of this region of India..."</p> <p>3. I ask the authors to carefully check compliance with all requirements for design of the manuscript. In particular, the name of table 2 should be at the top, not at the bottom. Also check the design of the formulas.</p> <p>4. I also ask the authors to check the text of the manuscript for technical errors. For example, the last paragraph on page 9 refers to Table 1. It seems to me that this reference should be made to Table 2.</p> <p>5. Subsection 2.4 states the following: "There is no maintenance cost for 50 hp vertical submersible pumps and 50 hp vertical propeller pumps for the first two years of the warranty period. Thereafter up to 10 years, annual maintenance cost is considered as 0.5 percent of the cost of pump and for the next 10 years it was taken at 1.0 percent of the total cost of pump". Where did these numerical data come from?</p> <p>6. In addition, there is some scope for improving grammar. I ask the authors to carefully review the text of the manuscript regarding the search and implementation of these possibilities. I will give several examples:</p> <p>At the end of page 2: "...have been investigated in a number of research [4] [5]". It is better to write: "...have been investigated in a number of researches, in particular in [4] and [5]".</p> <p>At the beginning of subsection 2.4: "The economics was worked out in terms..." It is better to write: "The economic analysis was performed using indicators..."</p> <p>When explaining the symbol t in formula (9): "Time period of project life, reckoned in years (one year)". It is better to write: "Number of the year of operation of the project during the general period of such operation."</p>	<p>There are no arithmetical errors in Table 1. The results are theoretically possible. IRR is more than discount rate so the measures are profitable. In the case of PP for petty and para pump the PP is 0.95 years (around 11 months) which means it will return the original cash investment in 11 months. In the case of VSP and VPP it is 0.3 (3.6 month) and 0.31 years (3.72 months) respectively. In the case of BCR, all the 3 cases it is more than unity so the project is worth. But when comparing 3 types of pumps VSP is economically better.</p> <p>Suggested correction were done in the manuscript</p> <p>Suggested correction were done in the manuscript</p> <p>Suggested correction were done in the manuscript</p> <p>The numerical data took from Irrigation Theory and practice by A.M Micheal. Let me show this in reference</p> <p>Suggested correction were done in the manuscript</p>



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM