

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_95065
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of mechanical seedling transplanter and deep placement of mixed fertilizer on rice yield
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many research titles like this have been made, it can be made more specific by mentioning the type of soil in the research location</li> <li>• The abstract section does not yet provide an overview of the formulation of the problem</li> <li>• which is the idea of the research</li> <li>• Results and discussion should not only provide a description of the results, but provide an analysis of the results. The results of the analysis were then compared with the results of other researchers' studies</li> <li>• in the bibliography and references that are used some are old, you should use the latest between the last 5-10 years</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid using conjunctions at the beginning of sentences</li> <li>• check grammar again</li> <li>• check again how to present the table</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>I Nengah Muliarta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Warmadewa University, Indonesia</b>