

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104581
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of tractor operated onion digger and optimization of different blade rake angle and forward speed
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)	<b>No (Optimization: I cannot find anywhere accept in the title)</b>	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	<b>No</b> Author needs to cover the following five sections for writing the abstract: 1. Reason for writing: What is the importance of the research? Why would a reader be interested in the larger work? 2. Problem: What problem does this work attempt to solve? What is the scope of the project? What is the main argument, thesis or claim? 3. Methodology: An abstract of a scientific work may include approaches used in the larger study. You may describe the types of evidence used in the research. 4. Results: An abstract of a scientific work may include specific data that indicates the results of the project. You may discuss the findings in a more general way. 5. Implications: How does this work add to the body of knowledge on the topic?	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>Yes</b>	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	<b>Yes</b>	
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>	<b>No</b>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>7. Other Major comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ I cannot find the optimization word anywhere accept in the title</li> <li>✓ Author needs to cover the following five sections for writing the abstract:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 1. Reason for writing: What is the importance of the research? Why would a reader be interested in the larger work?</li> <li>✓ 2. Problem: What problem does this work attempt to solve? What is the scope of the project? What is the main argument, thesis or claim?</li> <li>✓ 3. Methodology: An abstract of a scientific work may include approaches used in the larger study. You may describe the types of evidence used in the research.</li> <li>✓ 4. Results: An abstract of a scientific work may include specific data that indicates the results of the project. You may discuss the findings in a more general way.</li> <li>✓ 5. Implications: How does this work add to the body of knowledge on the topic?</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Lot of grammar mistakes</li> <li>✓ Many sentences are not clear, author needs to go through the manuscript line by line and improve it accordingly</li> <li>✓ (Anon. 2022) Please follow the Journal guidelines</li> <li>✓ Author may remove the fig 1</li> <li>✓ Author needs to give proper justification why there is need to develop a machine</li> <li>✓ P3 Authors did not state the objectives very clearly. They did not state why such study is important in the field of science</li> <li>✓ P3 What are the parameters author considered and measured for design of onion digger</li> <li>✓ P4 para 1 Please first discus all the parameters in detail, thereafter author can write this statement.</li> <li>✓ Please check the reference: Gomez and Gomez, 1984</li> <li>✓ Total number of plots 45 (3x3x5) of size 10 m x1.2 m was prepared in a total 750 m<sup>2</sup> plot. In this line what is 3x3x5 dimension, please clarify.</li> <li>✓ Please follow the journal guidelines for writing the equations</li> <li>✓ Table 1 What is DAT and ± symbol indicates author needs to explain it in the foot note of the table? Author needs to explain all the abbreviations.</li> <li>✓ Cost analysis section: If author can show the cost of equipment component wise then it will be more effective.</li> <li>✓ Please check 90 ₹ l<sup>-1</sup></li> <li>✓ 3RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section: the results and discussion section are written poorly. It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before. Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.</li> <li>✓ Please follow the consistency: % or percentage</li> <li>✓ Author needs to write the conclusion in following manner:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Restate your research topic.</li> <li>✓ Summarize the main points.</li> <li>✓ State the significance or results.</li> <li>✓ Conclude your thoughts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Please follow the journal guidelines for writing the references (eg. Reference no. 12 and 14 are having different formatting)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There is lot of grammar, English mistake and sentences are not clear. It very difficult for reader to understand. Therefore, it advisable to author to go through the manuscript line by line and improve it accordingly</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shashank Shekhar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, India</b>