

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126880
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing groundwater recharge and yield by adoption of continuous contour trenches in micro catchments
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of Continuous Contour Trenches (CCTs) for enhancing groundwater recharge and increasing crop yield in dryland regions, specifically in Vidarbha, Maharashtra. By quantifying the impacts of CCTs on soil moisture, groundwater levels, and crop productivity, this study contributes to sustainable agricultural practices that address water scarcity in semi-arid areas. The findings offer a practical conservation approach that can be used by researchers, policymakers, and field practitioners to improve water resource management and crop resilience. This research is particularly relevant for guiding resource-efficient practices in the face of climate variability and growing water demand in dryland agriculture.	Yes
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.	<b>It is good but need some improvement</b> <b>Background Context:</b> Briefly introducing the purpose of Continuous Contour Trenches (CCTs) in dryland agriculture. <b>Methodological Details:</b> Including more specific methods, such as the tools or techniques used to measure soil moisture, LAI, and groundwater recharge, would strengthen the scientific rigor of the abstract and allow for easier replication <b>Statistical Validation:</b> Indicating whether any statistical analyses were performed to validate the results, <b>Statistical Validation:</b> Indicating whether any statistical analyses were performed to validate the results <b>Implications for Stakeholders:</b> Instead of general statements on how the results could benefit researchers, field officers, farmers, and NGOs, briefly stating the specific applications for each group (such as guidance for water conservation or crop management strategies) would make the relevance clearer.	"We have expanded the abstract, methodology and results and discussion sections. Additionally, we have added an implications section."
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.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its methodical approach to assessing the impact of Continuous Contour Trenches (CCTs) on groundwater recharge and crop yield. The study design, involving a control and CCT-treated catchment area, allows for clear comparisons and helps isolate the effects of CCTs on key variables like soil moisture, groundwater levels, and crop productivity. By quantifying metrics such as Leaf Area Index (LAI), canopy interception, and yield increases, the manuscript provides valuable quantitative data that supports its conclusions. Additionally, the use of a two-year observation period enhances the reliability of the findings by accounting for seasonal variations, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of CCTs in dry land agriculture.	Yes
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Not sufficient are not recent should be modified	Recent references are added.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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)	No