

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_118511</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In-Situ Measurement of Unsaturated Hydraulic Conductivity Function By A NEW POINT Source Field Dripper Method (NPSFDM)</b>
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### **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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The central idea of this work is important. Strong experimental data validates the manuscript, which includes an original contribution. It is demonstrated that the scientific arguments are flawless and are fully backed by current references. Because more specific details are available than in past research studies, the reader can completely understand the concept and procedures of the current study. I suggest accepting this original work with some minor adjustments. The introduction did not address all of the research topic's points, and the reference utilized is somewhat old. The technique's part lacks significant information and factual accuracy with references. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details. Which statistical program was utilized in this study? The writer listed all the titles with their findings in the results and discussion section but did not discuss each point independently. This study employed the oldest references to support its methods, observations, and discussion. If you have any arguments, please provide statistical evidence to support them. The article's content is filled with numerous awkward sentences. The entire text has a lot of verbs and phrases that are repeated. The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shahira H. EL-Moslamy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute (GEBRI), City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications (SRTA-city), Egypt</b>