

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121141
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Water Productivity and Crop Performance of Cluster Bean, Cowpea and Pearl Millet in Arid Zones"
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is written with good grammatical expression. Introduction was brief and precise.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is ok.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract should be revised. There is need for author to include some important component of methodology such as study site, experimental design, replication, data collection and statistical tool. Follow format of introduction, methodology, results and conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some redundant sections were merged. This was corrected in the text.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Treatments were not clearly stated in the text. There are a lot of gaps in the methodology section such planting practice and management, maturity period, replication, weeding, as replication, statistical software used to analyse data, and degree of probability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Discussion was very scanty. Rainy and irrigation methods were silent and not discussed. These are key points in his research and should be related to the finding. Citing previous research findings that in contrast with your findings are equally important. Reference are cited are recent but scanty with some discrepancy in the text and reference section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hassan Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Bayero University, Nigeria