

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124501
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Crop Canopy and Rainfall Intensity on Runoff in Alfisols of Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka
Type of the Article	

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>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses runoff management in arid regions, providing valuable insights into the relationship between crop canopy cover and rainfall intensity. Its practical implications for sustainable agricultural practices make it a useful resource for farmers and land managers. I appreciate the actionable findings, but I would have liked to see a more robust statistical analysis and a broader range of treatments to enhance the depth of the study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Effects of Crop Canopy and Rainfall Intensity on Runoff in Alfisols of Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka," is suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the study, including the key variables (crop canopy, rainfall intensity, and runoff) and the specific geographical context.</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 of the article is generally comprehensive, providing an overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, a few modifications could enhance its clarity and completeness:</p> <p>Methodology Details: Briefly mention the experimental design, such as the number of replications or specific statistical methods used, to give readers a clearer understanding of the robustness of the study.</p> <p>Statistical Significance: Include a statement regarding the statistical significance of the findings, which would help readers gauge the reliability of the results.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are appropriate, however still there is an area for modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methods and materials sections should be explained in brief - the discussion section is missed the findings of the study are compared with other literatures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be better if the authors include the conclusion section also 	
<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>The scientific correctness of this manuscript is evident in its focused investigation of the relationship between crop canopy cover, rainfall intensity, and runoff—key variables in agricultural research. The field experiment design, which collects data over multiple runoff events, enhances the reliability of the findings. While more robust statistical analysis could improve the study, the systematic approach and clear presentation of results indicate that it is scientifically 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>:-</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript cover a range of relevant topics related to runoff, water management, and agricultural practices. However, several points can be noted regarding their sufficiency and recency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references are not sufficient to communicate the findings of the research • Some references, like the one from 1982, provide historical context but may not reflect the most current research trends or advancements in the field. Several references date back to the early 2000s and earlier, which may not adequately represent the latest developments in runoff research and sustainable agricultural practices. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Baye Terefe
Department, University & Country	Injibara University, Ethiopia