

### Review Form 3

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

#### 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>Compulsory</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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses a significant issue in arid regions, where water scarcity impacts agricultural and livestock productivity. The study's focus on optimizing water productivity through the conjunctive use of bore well and canal water provides valuable insights for improving sheep production in challenging climates. The practical implications for sustainable livestock management make this research relevant and beneficial for agricultural practitioners working in similar environments. However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer presentation and additional details in some sections to strengthen its impact.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is generally suitable but could be more precise and refined. For example: 'Optimizing Water Productivity through the Conjunctive Use of Bore well and Canal Water for Enhancing Sheep Productivity in Arid Regions.'	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a good overview but could be refined on following points: <b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b> <b>Simplify Sentences for Clarity:</b> Refine the language to improve clarity and readability. Ensure grammatical correctness and proper punctuation usage. <b>Include Statistical Methods:</b> If space permits, mention the statistical methods used to determine significance in the study. <b>Improve Flow of Language:</b> Rephrase awkward expressions to improve the overall flow. For instance, change "varied significantly different" to "varied significantly." <b>Clarify Key Concepts:</b> Provide a brief explanation of key concepts like "conjunctive use" to ensure clarity for the reader. <b>Expand on the Implications:</b> Consider expanding on the implications of the results, perhaps by offering specific recommendations or potential applications of the findings.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure are appropriate but could be improved for clarity. For example, the results section would benefit from a more detailed description of how statistical analyses were performed, and the discussion could more thoroughly address the implications of the findings. <b>Clarity and Conciseness:</b> The use of technical terms like "virtual water requirement" and "water productivity" might not be immediately clear to all readers. A brief explanation or definition could help. <b>Explanation of Significance:</b> While the results are stated, the significance of these differences could be more explicitly explained. For example, why is it important that canal water leads to a lower virtual water requirement? How does this impact the overall sustainability of sheep farming in arid regions?	

**Review Form 3**

	<p><b>Consistency in Terminology and units of measurements:</b> There is a slight inconsistency in how the data is presented. For instance, "per kilogram gain" is mentioned several times, but the term could be standardized (e.g., "per kilogram of weight gain" throughout). Some places units are not align with the table of results.</p> <p><b>Ensure Consistency in Units:</b> Maintain consistency in the use of units and symbols throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Overall, the study appears scientifically sound and technically correct in its design, measurement of outcomes, and interpretation of results. However, there are some potential limitations, particularly concerning the small sample size and the need for more detailed statistical reporting. Addressing and acknowledging these aspects would enhance the study's contribution to understanding water productivity in livestock farming under arid conditions.</p> <p><b>Additional Considerations:</b></p> <p><b>Control of Confounding Variables:</b> The study should confirm whether other variables, such as temperature, housing conditions, and health status, were controlled or accounted for, as these factors could influence water consumption and weight gain.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references could be updated with more recent studies, particularly those focusing on water management in arid regions and the impacts of water salinity on livestock productivity. Consider adding recent literature to strengthen the background and discussion sections.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language requires revisions for clarity and readability. Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified for better understanding. Many places abbreviations are not clearly define ex. SAR, ADG etc.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents valuable research but would benefit from improved clarity in the presentation of results and a more thorough discussion of the findings.</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)
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kunal M Shende</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nagpur University, India</b>