

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_114861
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of windbreaks (<i>Casuarina equisetifolia</i> L.) on productivity of paddy in South Gujarat
Type of the Article	Original

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. The title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive but the author must briefly mention the methodology used in the abstract. Quantified values should be given for the results.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but: - The introduction does not show the relevance of the study. What is the problem? What has been done in the past to solve it? What are the limitations? What can be done to close these gaps? - The data collected are not specified in the methodology: what growth and yield data are collected? what is the method used to collect this data? How the effect of windbreaks on the economy has been measured? How the effect of windbreaks on wind velocity has been measured? Discussion section needs improvement: The discussion should highlight the results through a well-argued scientific interpretation: the relevance of the work and its original contribution. In the discussion, you explain your results, i.e. you give them their scientific meaning. Scientific significance is the interpretation you make of the results obtained from your experiment, in relation to the objectives of the study defined in the introduction. This interpretation enables you to show how these results are original. By interpreting your results, you go beyond the simple observation of a fact, or the simple observation of a process: you analyze it in a scientific context of knowledge already acquired, i.e. already published.</p> <p>?? The methodology must be well described and detailed</p> <p>?? Most of the references cited in the document are old. An update with recent work is recommended.</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>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zoundji Mahougnon Charlotte Carmelle
Department, University & Country	Université Nationale d'Agriculture, Bénin