

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124246
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MINI-SPRINKLER IRRIGATION SYSTEM UNDER DIFFERENT PRESSURES AND SPACINGS
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: 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>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This manuscript will serve as a yard stick for harnessing water use efficiency by identifying an exact area of sprinkler swath. - It can also be used to optimize crop production. - It can also be used by small scale irrigation farmers. 	
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.	The abstract is ok	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methodology applied was scientifically standard. - Tables were well presented. - Scientific analyses were used to conclude results. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but require some corrections for full stops, comma where possible.	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is recommended for publication.	

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:	Ado Nasiru
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutse, Nigeria