

Manuscript: “**Combined Effect Of NozzleDispersion Device On Spray Pattern Uniformity For Low Pressure Sprinklers**”

Peer review:

**Submitted: 08 June 2020**

**Accepted: 02 September 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding author: Zakaria Issaka

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p145](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p145)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Mohamed Afechtal

National Institute for Agricultural Research / Morocco

**Reviewer 2:** Samuel Appah (Phd),

Abetifi Presbyterian College Of Education, Ghana

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Mohamed Afechtal	Email:
University/Country: National Institute for Agricultural Research / Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: Jun 30, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2020
Manuscript Title: Combined effect of nozzle-dispersion device on spray pattern uniformity for low pressure sprinklers	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0680/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear and providing idea about the content of the article</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract is precise and well summarized</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>There are few grammatical errors in the text but overall is good</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Methods are explained clearly</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Fulfill all requirements, overall manuscript body is structurally organized well</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Conclusion narratively addresses the issue well</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The same format should be followed for all references in reference section</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*Please work a little bit on sentence structure and proper use of past tense before final submission.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

*Please accept this article.*

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: SAMUEL APPAH (PhD)	Email:
University/Country: Abetifi Presbyterian College of Education, Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received: 6/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Combined effect of nozzle-dispersion device on spray pattern uniformity for low pressure sprinklers	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No : YES	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Many words are joined together in the manuscript. This could be as a results of transferring from one office to another. Carefully separate them as indicated in the manuscript.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The authors often refer to low pressure of 150kPa, meanwhile there is a pressure of 100kPa, clearly justify in the manuscript	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Some references are not in text</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. There are three pressure regimes (100, 150 and 200 kPa). Authors refer to 150 kPa as low. Such statements in the manuscript must be clarified.
2. Many words are joined together, kindly separate them throughout in the manuscript in indicated in the attached manuscript.

Other comments are provided in the attached manuscript for your perusal

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**