

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_124354
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Water Harvesting Techniques (Holes and Crescents) on Growth of Sidr (Ziziphus Spina-Christi) In South Omdurman Area, Khartoum State, Sudan
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>

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 present experiment entitled, "Effect of Water Harvesting Techniques (Holes and Crescents) on Growth of Sidr (Ziziphus Spina-Christi) In South Omdurman Area, Khartoum State, Sudan" is tackling the issue of water saving techniques for moisture conservation for agriculture. This is of global importance in agriculture in areas where rainfall is scanty for supplemental irrigation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article suitable.</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>Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive. However, comments are indicated within the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</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>	<p>This is of global importance in agriculture in areas where rainfall is scanty for supplemental irrigation. Thus, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, robust and technically sound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, referencing in the body of the text should be corrected as indicated in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. But, there are some errors which are indicated in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments are marked in the manuscript and should be corrected and addressed.</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Knight Nthebere
Department, University & Country	National University of Lesotho, Lesotho