

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126629
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF TELUGU GANGA PROJECT IN NELLORE DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA BASED ON IRRIGATION PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 irrigation performance indicators are important for irrigation efficiency and crop irrigation requirement in Agriculture. The project is implemented in paddy different indicator of irrigation. It is useful for farmers to cultivate efficient; low water requirement crops during drought and water-stress conditions to achieve maximum yield with canal water supply.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion the selected title is fit to the work done.	
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 needs improvement. In my opinion, it is somewhat lengthy, contains too much data, and lacks clarity. The author or authors should address the following questions in the abstract section: Why did you conduct the study? What did you do? What did you find? What did you conclude?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I recommend the study area should come under the Method and Material. Also the text under heading of study area is much mor and unrelated. I recommend it should be put on a new heading of Literature review.	
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.	Literature review should be added!	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, in my opinion the cited refences are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments	In my opinion the language is quality is good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lutfullah Safi
Department, University & Country	Kabul University, Afghanistan