

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAAR_95185 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Development of a Domestic Water Medium Rice De-Stoning Machine |
| Type of the Article | Original 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.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) |
|---|--|---|
| Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | The manuscript is important for scientific community. The title of the article is suitable. "Development of a Domestic Water Medium Rice De-Stoning Machine" The abstract of the article is comprehensive. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent. I do not have suggestion of additional references. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications. I could do some corrections. | |
| Optional/General comments | Optional/General comments | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Maria Elena Sánchez Pardo |
| Department, University & Country | Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Mexico |