

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104581</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development of tractor operated onion digger and optimization of different blade rake angle and forward speed</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research article</b>

### **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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b> <b>Yes</b> <b>Abstract:</b> The main objective is quite unclear. Optimized results need to be added in the abstract for more impact. <b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authors are advised to revise or use more current literature for onion production (one year back or this year).</li> <li>• Objective is unclear</li> <li>• Lack of flow and consistency</li> <li>• The author said that the 'digger isn't adequate to the task, it's probable that the soil conditions in other regions of India are different'. Justify this sentence. (What type of soil is there, and why other diggers are not suitable in Chhattisgarh) explain with suitable literature.</li> </ul> <p><b>Material and methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write about the soil parameters and plant parameters and explain how these parameters are important in the design of diggers.</li> <li>• Figure 1: show the components by adding clear visible images of the digger.</li> <li>• Add more images of the digger construction stage</li> <li>• Write the calculation procedure of the required power to operate the onion digger</li> <li>• Justify why you selected the particular angles and speed as well as the type of material for construction.</li> <li>• Show the layout of the experimental design</li> <li>• Enrich the "performance evaluation" part with formulas and using recent literature.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Show the pictures of the trial plot and the digger being tested.</b></li> <li>• Explain clearly about break-even point and pay-back period</li> <li>• Lack of discussion in the literature.</li> </ul> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrary to the manuscript's references, in-text citations are incorrect.</li> <li>• References are listed in the text that isn't mentioned in text.</li> <li>• Years differ from text to reference.</li> <li>• References from recently are required.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Fair</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check the grammar and spelling mistakes</li> <li>• The literature's flow wasn't excellent enough; go back and rewrite it for better consistency and flow.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gorla Gayathri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mohan Babu University, India</b>