

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121247
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of water conservation technologies on growth and yield of green gram pearl millet intercrop in semi-arid Kenya.
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.	This is a well conducted study on effect of water conservation technologies on green gram and pearl millet. The results of the findings suggest sole cropping with certain water technologies as efficient methods of crop growing strategy. This study could help students, researchers and farmers on getting a guideline on how to receive maximum benefit by incorporating the most efficient technologies. These practices can be adopted by farmers in semi-arid Kenya where water scarcity is prominent.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the paper should rather be "Effect of water conservation technologies on growth and yield of green gram with pearl millet intercrop in semi-arid Kenya"	
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 of the article is comprehensive. All the information provided by the author is apt.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate	
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.	The author has done a thorough study on the difference in cropping systems and water harvesting technology. It seems technically sound. They have used RBD with Split Plot design and their difference in mean effect are well portrayed by the author.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are recent and the author has spent a fair amount of time collecting the references. However, in this manuscript, in the references corresponding to the citations are not fully given. I can see references ending upto the letter M. There are other citations which the author has mentioned in the script but references have not been given.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript and sentence formation issues. I believe the editorial team will take care of that. Overall, it is a well-written article.	
Optional/General comments	Some information could be deleted in order to reduce the length of the article. The formula of LAI and Grain yield need to be corrected. LAI unit is given as m ² in the formula. It should be m ² . Grain yield should be kg ha ⁻¹ . Maintain the spacing between the elements in the formulas. In some tables, a,b,c is not mentioned as superscript. Eg . (0.35)a can be written as (0.35) ^a . The legend present in 3 rd , 4 th Table giving a good description of the contents is absent in Table 1. The superscript a, b,c is absent in Table 8.	

Review Form 3

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:	Nishtha Pradarshika Rai
Department, University & Country	Uttar Banga Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India