Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_126880**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of effect of continuous contour trenches for groundwater recharge and yield rising at Akola in Vidarbha**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the scientific community by addressing a relevant topic that could enhance our understanding of the field. The findings presented offer insights that may inform future research and practical applications. However, the manuscript requires further refinement to improve clarity and coherence. Strengthening the methodology and expanding the discussion on implications would enhance its overall impact and significance.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title of the article is not suitable as it lacks a comprehensive discussion and recommendations that would provide context and insight into the findings. An alternative title could be: "Enhancing Understanding: Key Findings and Recommendations for Future Research." This title emphasizes the need for discussion and actionable insights.**	
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.	**There is no research gap. Abbreviations should be avoided, and it is unnecessary to refer to individuals using titles such as 'Dr.' followed by their institution, like 'PDKV, Akola.' Additionally, there is no a conclusion or recommendations in the abstract part.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Good**	
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.	**he manuscript demonstrates a solid foundation in its methodology and data analysis, indicating a scientifically robust approach. However, it requires the addition of a discussion section to contextualize the findings and identify any research gaps. Including a thorough analysis of the implications of the results and recommendations for future studies would enhance its technical soundness. Addressing these elements will strengthen the overall contribution of the manuscript to the scientific community.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**Good**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Good	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	**Fekede Terefe Gemeda**
Department, University & Country	**Ethiopia**