

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125547
Title of the Manuscript:	"Rice Production in Water-Scarce Environments: A Review Of Conservation Agriculture Techniques"
Type of the Article	Review 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The objective of this manuscript is to elucidate the resilience of agricultural water resources through the implementation of conservation methods in order to address the issue of water scarcity in agriculture. The discussion proposed in this manuscript is of considerable interest, as it elucidates the significant impact that water-scarce environments in quantity aspect have on global food security in the context of rice production. In this manuscript, there were 10 (ten) conservation agriculture techniques observed that might able to promote water sustainability in rice production. However, the studies in question lack sufficient depth and breadth, and thus warrant further, more comprehensive examination. Furthermore, this manuscript employs qualitative methods in its review of numerous academic articles. Consequently, it is essential to discuss the selection of conservation agriculture technology, the impact of optimal CA methods on water resilience, and to exclude certain perspectives that are not reflected in the review articles section i.e. "Integration of conservation agriculture with digital agriculture technologies, such as drones and satellite imaging". In addition, as this was a review article manuscript, it was necessary for the authors' experiences and disciplinary backgrounds to be included in the methods section in order to provide an appropriate perspective.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title did not accurately reflect the content of the manuscript, the manuscript exclusively detailed the discussion of conservation agriculture techniques, and the focus on water scarcity was limited to the quantity aspect in agriculture. I recommend to be A Review of Conservation Agriculture Techniques for Quantity Water Scarcity Improvement in Rice Production.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract requires more consistency in its alignment with the title, introduction, and discussion. It is essential to demonstrate the selection and solution of the most effective conservation agriculture technique. In the concluding sentences, it is recommended to provide greater specificity, illustrating the study's future perspectives on water scarcity in rice production.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It is necessary to establish a connection between the introduction and the conservation agriculture/rice production techniques. In addition, please add the methods of review and more discussion on water scarcity in agriculture.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a discrepancy between the study flow and the title of the manuscript. It is necessary to examine rice production on a global scale to ascertain whether a solution exists. Subsequently, the issue of water scarcity can be discussed. Following this, an investigation into water conservation techniques for agricultural purposes can be conducted. 2. The primary considerations in water supply are quantity, quality, and continuity. While the discussion of CA methods primarily addresses the quantity aspect, the introduction provides a more comprehensive overview of water resilience. 3. Please add references for this sentence "By promoting CA practices among smallholder farmers, we can help to ensure food security, reduce poverty, and protect the environment for future generations." That will make bias between hypothesis, objectives, or perspectives. 4. Please used line number in manuscript to make easier comments in detail. 5. Integrated water management discussion section lack observation of water resources that important in IWRM to improve water resilience, please refer below literature for detail discussion https://doi.org/10.1080/07900620701723240, https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060802272820, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.217. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The section on future prospects lacked any references to literature. Similarly, information concerning digital agriculture techniques, such as drones and satellite imaging, which have the potential to conserve water, did not include any references. Furthermore, alternative water sources, such as brackish water and wastewater, also require additional references.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A number of errors were identified in the English writing, for example, in the sentence "We examine the evidence from various studies and identify the constraints and opportunities for adoption among smallholder farmers." This was deemed to be inappropriate academic English, as the examination had already been performed. It was therefore requested that the past tense be used as appropriate in the methods and discussion sections.	
Optional/General comments	A major comment is that the authors refer to digital agriculture technologies, water resources alternatives management, and climate-resilient agriculture without explaining in most of the cases that the agriculture water conservation in detail. This could bring the ideas to the readers that remote sensing of environmental and integrated water resources management is not sufficient important than conservation agriculture techniques for water resilience improvement, which could be a huge mistake. Therefore, I would recommend the authors to revise the manuscript keeping this in mind. Please be more consistent in phrase selection for example conservation agriculture techniques or rice production techniques were discussed in a similar context in the manuscript.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satrio Budi Prakoso
Department, University & Country	Ehime University, Indonesia