

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127943
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Financial Viability of Tank Restoration under Mission Kakatiya and its Impact on Farm Income
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the financial viability of tank restoration initiatives, specifically under Mission Kakatiya, and their impact on enhancing farm income. By evaluating the economic and agricultural benefits of such interventions, it contributes to the growing body of research on sustainable water resource management, rural livelihoods, and the effectiveness of government programs in addressing agrarian challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES but needed certain improvements in the methodology and interpretation part.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Can refer the most recent ones.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please write the formulas in the methodology part from the standard references and explain their relevance in your study, also explain the how the data available for the before and after period.	

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:	Remalli Anthony
Department, University & Country	Anand Agricultural University, India