



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40090
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Vegetation on the Development of Erosion Between Furrows in a Semi-arid Environment
Type of the Article	<u>Review Article</u>

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) Title: Title needs to be modified 2) Abstract: Abstract should not match with the introduction it should be unique and well organised, in your manuscript abstract is just the copy paste of line no15-18,25-29and 31-34 3) Sub section2:the equations are not clear, whether there is any subscription or brackets and the equation which is referenced by 55 is not found 4) Sub section titles need to be changed or modified 5) There is a need to modify the language, it is not clear at various places for e.g line no 222-225 6) Conclusion: conclusion needs to be elaborated, 7) Please add some recent citations 8) There are very less citations on modelling approach of quantifying amount of soil loss	1) The title was modified to: Interrill erosion in semi-arid soils: impacts and vegetation as an attenuating factor in erosive processes 2) As requested, the abstract has been redone. 3) The equations were revised. 4) Sub sections have been renamed. 5) As requested, the text has been revised. 6) The conclusion was elaborated. 7) As requested, some recent citations have been added, eg. 104, 105, 106, 107, 108. 8) The citations were revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is well referenced but coherence is missing, please revise it	As requested, the manuscript was revised.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would have been better if you would have mentioned some agronomic practices, of preventing soil loss, like contour farming, strip cropping etc	Very important, although the manuscript deals with the importance of native vegetation, the authors think that talking about conservation practices would escape the theme.