



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6353
Title of the Manuscript:	PERIODIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF GROUNDWATER QUALITY – A CHALLENGE FOR AGRICULTURE
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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 (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	Are the authors really conducting periodic assessment or one study at snap-shot of a time? I would rephrase the title or simply remove the word "periodic"	Done. Title has been revised as suggested.
Minor REVISION comments	1- Move study objectives to the introduction section 2- Rephrase the study objectives to 3 or max 4 3- Please specify the depth of the wells 4- Table 1-10 are not needed, use some remarks from tables in the text 5- I would delete figure 2. 6- You demonstrate your results by both figures and tables; I would suggest use only figures and elaborate on them in the results section. 7- Gypsum is usually added to Sodic soils not to water; please elaborate a bit more on this. 8- You suggest proper drainage system or	1. Done 2. Done 3. Done 4. Done/table 1-10 removed as suggested by the kind reviewer 5. Done/figure 2 deleted as suggested by the kind reviewer 6. As the two reviewers suggested to omit figures and to use only tables, so I have omitted figures and used tables only. 7. Done 8. Yes it will be. Included as suggested 9. No sharing of aquifer with India



SDI Review Form 1.6

	proper crop rotation; would fallow-legume-grain rotation be suitable? Please provide an example of a crop rotation suitable to the study region. 9- Is the aquifer shared with India? 10-Is there any studies in the region about the potential radioactivity in the groundwater, this is of course if the ground water is used also for drinking purposes? 11-Please explain a bit more why you have chosen this particular area for investigating 12-Please elaborate a bit about the use of chemical fertilisers and whether they pose threat to GW. 13- Please refer to a study by Gleeson et al 2012 (Water balance of global aquifers revealed by groundwater footprint) to check the status of the study region for GW footprint).	10. No studies about the potential radioactivity in the groundwater have been done so far, in this region. Authors plan to undertake the kind idea of reviewer and work on it in future research. 11. This particular area being semi-arid has been chosen where salinity and alkalinity are considered the main threats to the sustainable irrigation agriculture. Besides, almost 70% of the agricultural production comes from this region of the province. So, it holds a central position in the agricultural economy of KP province. 12. Done 13. Done
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a good paper. However some minor changes may upgrade the MS from a report-like to an interesting article. The introduction section can be slightly improved to have the objectives at the end. The results are good, but fragmented. I would merge them in one sub-title like “Ions concentration”. Too much use of figures and tables. I would not use tables 1-10. Simply cite them. Please consider the points above especially point 6.	• Results merged in one sub-title “Ions concentration” as suggested. • Too much use of tables and figures has been omitted. Tables 1-10 have been omitted as suggested by the kind reviewer.
---	---	--