

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125499
Title of the Manuscript:	Rainfall Analysis and groundwater studies for soil and water conservation in Kodihalli sub - watershed of Haveri district, Karnataka
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 provides a valuable approach for achieving sustainable water resource management by analyzing watershed budgets. This method allows other researchers to apply similar techniques to evaluate and optimize water use in their own watersheds, potentially ensuring long-term water availability. By implementing such strategies, water shortages can be mitigated, contributing to effective water conservation and management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitable	
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.	Lack of Contextual Background Lacks objective Lack of method Limited Discussion of Implications	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not follow all, there is no computing interest in this manuscript	
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 manuscript lacks a detailed methodology and does not clearly state its research objectives, which makes it difficult to assess the study's approach and purpose. Additionally, there is no discussion on competing interests or dissimilarities with other studies, which reduces its contextual relevance. Major revisions are needed to include these elements, as well as to enhance the manuscript's clarity and coherence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is not sufficient but it is recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Precipitation data should be more than ten years. The gauge stations should be mentioned Estimation of recharge should be clearly stated coherency of the the paper should be looked	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Mekonen Gedewon Aynalem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mekdela Amba University, Ethiopia</b>