SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_47167**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFICIENCY OF HYDRAULIC RAM PUMPS MADE WITH ALTERNATIVE MATERIALS**
Type of the Article	**Short 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)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Capital and lowercase letters used in Figures 3 and 4, to distinguish between different configurations, are confuse. A different methodology should be used. In Figure 4 it is seen that the yield of hydraulic ram for 90º and 1/3 inch is lower that those obtained with the same angle and 1/4 to 1/6 inches, which are quite the same. Nothing is said in the text about this,	We think that we could not present the results in a different way. Thus, we considered that the way we presented the results, besides it is confuse, we can show the understanding to the readers. The description and explanation were added to the text.
Optional/General comments	This manuscript is objective and clear and deals with an interesting subject particularly for developing countries. Authors also point future research. I suggest that the yield of hydraulic ram should be calculated using a higher capacity PET bottle. Conclusions are fairly supported by results described. However, in a revised version of the manuscript tables with obtained results should be given.	It was added to the discussion. Two new tables were added to the text (Tables 2 and 3). Thank you for your contributions!

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	