

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122762
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Water Productive by Conjunctive use of Borewell and Canal Water to Improve Productivity of Sheep in Arid Climate
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> 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.	Though the study has the potential of making an impact on the cattle rearing w.r.t. sheep but the same hasn't been quoted well in this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be more informative than just being a general one.	
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 to quote the major findings if the study which is not available in the present form. The same has been highlighted and suggested in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not to its full extent as some sections and information (highlighted in the manuscript) makes no connection with the title of the research paper as well as the study objectives.	
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 study needs to be corrected sincerely following the suggestions to make it scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Cited references are ok but their citations are erroneous and need immediate and firm attention.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript needs major revision which are duly suggested in the manuscript to make it better and communicate correctly to its readers.</p> <p>What is the uniqueness of the present study is out of my purview? I firmly believe it is not the research based on secondary data analysis then why every single outcome of the study has to be backed with an existing literature which infer the same results? The result section needs to be thoroughly re-written.</p> <p>On what basis such statements are being quoted is again my major concern. What about the parameter's readings? Have the author/s considered the role of extraneous variables like weather, sheep's health on the feeding day, their feeding pattern otherwise, quality of the feed right from its storage, if there is any other study for the present study region with same rationale? The results are not complimenting neither the tile of the manuscript nor the objectives. The result section needs major revision to make it communicable.</p> <p>What the author/s are communicating through this research? Should one use borewell water, canal water or what? Conclusion should have a well-defined study inference, author's recommendations, policy approach along with future implications which are completely missing in this.</p> <p>All these for references have four different styles of citing the literature which not acceptable. Follow one format for all the references and duly write the page numbers in each and every literature which is missing presently. This rection needs to be re-written CAREFULLY</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Amit Pandey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>