

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_129239
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Maize Productivity through Mulching Practices in Semi-Arid Regions: Impact on Yield, Water Use Efficiency, and Economic Viability
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.	The Manuscript was well written and showed clearly how maize productivity was enhanced in ASAL areas. However the Author need to show his hypothesis, objective(s), methodology , data analysis	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Tittle may not stand on its own. I suggest the Author to include the site, region, and country of the Semi-Arid land	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive I suggest addition of statistical software used in the analysis and at least report on Analysis of variance of morphological parameters of maize show differences	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The Manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, although some are old. Addition of at least 5 most recent will be better	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest and recommend that the Manuscript can be accepted for publication after the Author(s) considers the following suggestions. Tittle. 1. I trust adding the region and Country will provide clarity 2. Section 2 Materials and Method. Should be able to demonstrate to the reader like tour guide how the study was done as: Figure 1 is not clear and visible, show grid reference and description of site. Soil sample collection and Analysis are not indicated. Methodology of data analysis to be indicated Results. I hope the editor will observe this. 1. The Authors have more results from data collected for two years. 2. Table 2. Suggest to be built on for result interpretation	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ibrahim Haji Issak
Department, University & Country	Lukenya University, Kenya