

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_116500
Title of the Manuscript:	ADAPTATION OF INNOVATIVE INTERVENTIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF WATER USE EFFICIENCY: AN EXPERIENCE OF FARMERS' EMPOWERMENT IN SSPC
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. yes</p> <p>2. yes, the title is suitable, but it can be improve to "Empowering Farmers to Enhance Water Efficiency: Innovative Practices in SSPC" the suggestion is more concise and focused title that captures the key elements of the research</p> <p>3. Abstract: Shorten the abstract by removing excessive detail and simplifying language to make it more accessible. Use a structured format: introduce the problem, briefly mention the methodology, highlight key findings, and conclude with the main implications. Include a specific result or statistic to show the tangible benefits of the research and strengthen the conclusion by stating how this research contributes to the field.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate manuscript.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. No add more references</p>	<p>2. Title of the manuscript has been changed to "Empowering Farmers to Enhance Water Efficiency: Innovative Practices in SSPC" as suggested by the Reviewer.</p> <p>3. Abstract has been rewritten as per the suggesting of the Reviewer.</p> <p>6. Few reference of the similar studies have been added and cited appropriately in the manuscript.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language in the article mostly meets academic standards, but here are key areas for improvement:</p> <p>1. Clarity and Precision: Simplify complex sentences to improve clarity and accessibility. 2. Technical Terminology: Ensure all technical terms are clearly defined for a broad audience. 3. Grammar and Syntax: Address grammatical errors through careful proofreading. 4. Consistency and Style: Maintain consistent styling according to academic formatting guidelines. 5. Coherence and Flow: Enhance the logical flow between sections for better readability.</p> <p>Refining these aspects will make the manuscript more professional and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	<p>As per the suggestions of the Reviewer, the manuscript has been simplified according to academic standards and highlighted.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the provided abstract and excerpts of the attached article titled "Adaptation of Innovative Interventions for Enhancement of Water Use Efficiency: An Experience of Farmers' Empowerment in SSPC," :</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Language and Clarity: As previously noted, the language could be simplified for clarity and to enhance accessibility to a broader audience, including those for whom English is not a first language. 2. Structural Organization: The manuscript might benefit from a clearer structure, particularly in how results are presented and discussed. Ensuring each section flows logically into the next would aid reader comprehension. 3. Detailed Methodology: For academic rigor, the methodology section should clearly describe the procedures and justifications for chosen methods, ensuring that other researchers could replicate the study. 4. Critical Analysis: The discussion could be strengthened by a more critical analysis of the results,</p>	<p>As per the suggestions of the Reviewer, the content of the Manuscript like Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion has been simplified according to academic standards and highlighted.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>including limitations and potential biases in the study. 5*Impact Quantification: Where possible, providing more quantified impacts of the interventions could make the case stronger and more compelling.</p> <p>Conclusion: The article is a valuable contribution to the field of agricultural water management. With some revisions for clarity, structure, and depth of analysis, it has the potential to make a significant impact in scholarly and practical contexts.</p>	
--	--	--

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>	Nil