

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98079
Title of the Manuscript:	AUTOMATION IN AGRICULTURAL AND BIOSYSTEMS ENGINEERING
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly for those working in the fields of agricultural and biosystems engineering. The manuscript discusses the transformation of agricultural machinery and the significant role of automation in improving the efficiency and productivity of agricultural systems. The research also aims to provide insights into how developing countries like Nigeria can adopt automation to boost agricultural production. As such, the manuscript has the potential to contribute to ongoing discussions and advancements in the field of agricultural engineering, and could be useful for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers interested in improving agricultural productivity through technology and innovation. 2. the title "Automation in Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering" appears to be suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. The title is concise, specific, and captures the main theme of the research. It effectively communicates the focus of the manuscript, which is to explore the role of automation in improving the efficiency and productivity of agricultural machinery. Overall, the title is appropriate for scholarly communication and can effectively attract the attention of readers interested in the topic of automation in agricultural and biosystems engineering. 3. The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the main themes and topics covered in the manuscript. It describes the historical context of the industrial revolution and its impact on agriculture, highlights the importance of automation in improving the efficiency and productivity of agricultural machinery, and suggests the potential benefits of adopting automation in agriculture for developing countries like Nigeria. <p>However, the abstract could benefit from more specific information about the types of agricultural machines that have been automated, the specific tasks they perform, and the methods and data sources used to support the research. Additionally, a summary of the main findings or conclusions would make the abstract more comprehensive and provide a clear indication of what the research actually found.</p> <p>Overall, while the abstract is informative and provides a good introduction to the topic of automation in agricultural and biosystems engineering, it could be improved by providing more specific details and summarizing the main findings or conclusions of the research.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are suitable and clearly spell out the authors' research and conclusions. 5. The authors' findings are supported by enough data, and the paper follows scientific best practices. 7. The references given are complete and up to date. 8. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Based on the article, the language and English quality appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The article is well-written, clear, and uses appropriate academic language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the article provides a good introduction to the topic of automation in agricultural and biosystems engineering. It presents a brief history of the industrial revolution and its impact on agriculture, and highlights the significance of automation in improving the efficiency and productivity of agricultural machinery. The article also suggests the potential benefits of adopting automation in agriculture for a developing country like Nigeria.</p> <p>However, there are a few areas that could be improved. First, the article could be more specific in</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	discussing the types of agricultural machines that have been automated and the specific tasks they perform. Second, while the article mentions the benefits of automation, it does not discuss any potential challenges or limitations that may arise from its implementation. Third, the article could provide more information on the research methods and data sources used to support the claims made. Finally, the article should include a sentence summarizing the main findings or conclusions of the research. Without this, the article leaves the reader wondering what the research actually found.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priyambodo Nur Ardi Nugroho
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Perkapalan Negeri, Indonesia