

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_106185
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Drip Irrigation Efficiency through Novel Statistical Modeling of Wetting Patterns in Water-Scarce Agriculture
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The findings from this manuscript was good however need few parts of improvement: 1) Introduction- the discussion on empirical equations by varies researchers (ex: amin & ekhmaj, 2015; Kandalous and simunek, 2010; al-ogaidi et al., 2016) was unclear. It is interesting if explain the different parameters used among their empirical eq development and their performances (weakness@advantages) 2) Reorganize your figures and tables name. Please put the figures name after the figure tables name before the table. Figure 1 is missing 3) Please put legend in all equations used 4) Every figure and table included in the manuscript must have explanation in the text. 5) Methodology and Results were mixed. Please re-arrange the content 6) Lack of discussion on findings</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nurul Nadrah Aqilah Bt Tukimat
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia