

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118328
Title of the Manuscript:	Water Stress: Between Farmers' Needs and Public Policies The Case of Smallholder Farmers in the Villages of Nabatieh Governorate
Type of the Article	Research article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The research has core important values for scientific community, since waters a life for every living things plus the basic necessity for the increasing industries.</p> <p>2. For me it's good and accepted</p> <p>3. The abstract is good but, it lacks some forms of summery and conclusion. Therefore to make the paper more sound full and valuable it's better to add that part with one or two sentences.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well organized</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct in my expectation</p> <p>6. The references were recent but the reference in the result and discussion part is not sufficient. To increase the value of this research it's better to improve the result with additional references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language researcher used is clear and suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The overall comment: The manuscript is well organized and written with good scientific language. I add some miner grammar correction and some points that need references. In addition the result and discussion part needs additional references, since the reference what I get on the paper is not enough</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abdisa Abebe Gerbi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assosa University, Ethiopia</b>