

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2045
Title of the Manuscript:	Drip Design and Crop Geometry for Drip Irrigated Rice Cultivation
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of water scarcity in agriculture by exploring efficient water management practices through drip irrigation in rice cultivation. The findings provide valuable insights into optimizing irrigation systems to enhance yield and water use efficiency, which are crucial for sustainable agriculture. I appreciate this manuscript because it combines rigorous scientific methodology with practical applications, offering solutions that can be directly implemented by farmers. The study's relevance to current environmental challenges and its potential to improve agricultural productivity make it a significant contribution to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No I suuggested the alternative title 1. Optimal Drip Irrigation Configurations for Rice: A Study on Yield and Economic Returns 2. Economic and Agronomic Benefits of Drip Irrigation in Rice Production	

Review Form2

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.	No 1. The abstract is comprehensive and covers various aspects of the study, including the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. Additions: 1. Context and Justification: Briefly mention the global significance of rice and the challenges posed by water scarcity, providing a rationale for the study. 2. Methodology Specifics: Clarify the experimental design and key variables, including crop growth conditions and evaluation metrics. 3. Conclusion: Summarize the practical implications of the findings for rice cultivation practices. Deletions: 1. Excessive Detail: Remove overly detailed numerical data and complex descriptions that can be better presented in the main text or tables (e.g., specific yield figures and economic returns for all treatments). 2. Repetition: Eliminate repetitive information about the benefits of direct seeding and the specific spacing configurations. Keywords: It is good if authors improve them. The function of keywords is to supplement the information given in the title. Words in the title are automatically included in indexes, and keywords serve as additional pointers.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a well-structured experimental design, including clear variables, control measures, and a detailed methodology. The study thoroughly investigates the impact of various dripper spacings, discharge rates, and crop geometries on rice yield, water use efficiency, and economic returns, ensuring comprehensive data collection and analysis. The results are statistically validated, and the conclusions drawn are supported by empirical evidence. Additionally, the research addresses a critical issue in agriculture water scarcity and provides practical, evidence-based recommendations for improving water productivity in rice cultivation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, some sentences could be refined for clarity, conciseness, and readability. See from the manuscript in track change	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dessie Gieta Amare
Department, University & Country	Debre Markos University, Ethiopia