



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_24749
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Validation of a Decision Support System for Runoff Water Harvesting and Irrigation - a Case Study of Beans at Ukwe, Malawi
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General remarks ✚ Change the format of the manuscript and references according to the journal's recommendations (see paper template file online) both in the text and the reference list. ✚ Manage better the pages of the manuscript because there are too many empty lines. ✚ Carefully read the manuscript in order to make it readable for the scientific community. For example at line 79, you can use water depth instead of the amount water. Lines 80 and 187, I should put analysis not analyses. Line 83 and 88 are incomplete sentences. Line 138, there are no chapter "three" in this manuscript. Pay attention while using the word "means". You can use "average". ✚ Avoid inserting tables or figures as images. ✚ Adapt the captions to the content of tables or figures. ✚ Do not use abbreviations without defining them previously. Abstract You can use accessibility instead of attainability. Use comma between keywords and adapted them according to the manuscript title. For example instead of "designing", you can use "water harvesting". Introduction	Formats for text and reference changed Pages adjusted, where possible empty spaces reduced Yes, manuscript re-read and improvements made. Yes, as much as possible tables and figures not made as images Captions related to the table and figure contents. Yes, abstract key word separation improved accordingly The word '<i>design</i>' is purposely used with respect to the Decision Support System Development based on <i>modelling</i>.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Background is poor in previous work carried out in sub-Saharan Africa on farmers' willingness to adopt surface water harvesting technologies. State of rainwater harvesting technologies in sub-Saharan Africa. Material and methods Lack of details in this part. Characterize the input data (type, time step, etc.). Is it experimental data? If yes, please specify periods. Is it a field trial or historical data? If it is a field trial, please specify the adopted experimental design to set up treatments and describe it. The data collection technique for assessing the willingness of farmers to invest in runoff harvesting is not presented at all. What is the size of your sample? And what is the sampling method? What is about the calibration of the model? Results and discussion The discussion is poor. Recent studies were completed on the willingness of sub-Saharan farmers to invest in irrigation. Conclusion and recommendations The conclusion is too long. Bring out the main findings. References ✚ Respect the recommended standards and adapt it to the journal requirements. ✚ Arrange authors in alphabetically	Back ground information on willingness to invest and rainwater harvesting briefly added More information of field data collection added. Crop grown for purpose of calibration and validation. It is a Decision Support System (DSS) Development based on MS excel functions using available climate, catchment and irrigation data. Cropped area agronomic and irrigation practices as recommended by government. The other sites used for DSS calibration and validation. As explained above this has been improved upon, though was only a supplementary aspect of the work. Yes, reduced though other reviewers wanted more issues included Yes, done in line with journal requirement Agreed, only that the journal recommends the authors to be arranged in order as they appear in the text
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		