

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
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	Research Paper

#### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the economic feasibility of tank restoration under Mission Kakatiya in Telangana, India. By evaluating key parameters such as cropping intensity, crop yields, and financial metrics like net present worth (NPW), benefit-cost ratio, and internal rate of return (IRR), the study offers evidence-based insights into the benefits of such restoration projects. The findings underscore the potential of tank systems to enhance agricultural productivity and improve water resource management, particularly in semi-arid regions. This research can serve as a valuable reference for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners aiming to implement or evaluate similar restoration initiatives in other regions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Suggested Alternative Title:</b>  <i>"Economic Feasibility of Tank Restoration under Mission Kakatiya: Impacts on Cropping Intensity and Farm Income"</i>	
<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 provided is fairly comprehensive as it highlights the objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions of the study. However, it can be improved by ensuring a more balanced coverage of all aspects and by providing a clearer connection between the findings and their implications. Here are some suggestions:	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Based on the summary of the manuscript provided, the study appears to be scientifically sound as it employs appropriate methodologies to evaluate the financial feasibility of tank restoration under Mission Kakatiya. Key economic indicators such as Net Present Worth (NPW), Benefit-Cost (B:C) ratio, and Internal Rate of Return (IRR) are standard and robust tools for assessing financial viability. Additionally, the analysis of cropping intensity and crop yield impacts provides direct evidence of the restoration's agricultural benefits.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>references sufficient</b>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality of the article appears to be generally suitable for scholarly communication, as the key concepts and technical details are clearly presented	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is relevant and has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to agroforestry research. Addressing these points will enhance its clarity, scientific rigor, and impact.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yadvendra Pal Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lovely Professional University, India</b>