

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. yes 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 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. 4. Yes , the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate manuscript. 5. Yes , the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. No add more references	2. Title of the manuscript has been changed to "Empowering Farmers to Enhance Water Efficiency: Innovative Practices in SSPC" as suggested by the Reviewer. 3. Abstract has been rewritten as per the suggesting of the Reviewer. 6. Few reference of the similar studies have been added and cited appropriately in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes , the language in the article mostly meets academic standards, but here are key areas for improvement: 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. Refining these aspects will make the manuscript more professional and suitable for scholarly communication.	As per the suggestions of the Reviewer, the manuscript has been simplified according to academic standards and highlighted.
Optional/General comments	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," : Areas for Improvement: 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,	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.

Review Form 1.7

	<p>including limitations and potential biases in the study.</p> <p>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