

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_97480
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Some Engineering Properties of Gmelina Arborea Seed
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	It focuses on characterization of Gmelina Arborea Seed regarding its physical and some mechanical properties.  No, I suggest the following title: "Investigation of some physical and mechanical properties of Gmelina Arborea Seed"  Yes  Somewhat  It needs modifications  Additional updated references are required	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. Modification of the title 2. Enrich the references. 3. Addition of the research objectives at the end of the introduction as a separated paragraph. 4. Very poor discussion for the results. No literature comparison and no references for similar works. 5. No conclusions!!	

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ibtisam Kamal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Soran University, Iraq</b>