

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_100625
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Mechanized Field Operations for Production of Sugar Cane in the Central Clay Plain of White Nile Area– Sudan
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper is evaluated the level of mechanization and cost implications especially to sugar cane production. More scientific communities need such information and data for proper planning and financing of the operation thus this paper will help the concern stakeholders 2. The tile is suitable as it is concise 3. The abstract of the manuscript is detailed on the four essentials of a good abstract: introduction, methodology, results and conclusion 4. The subsections and structure are adequate and appropriate 5. The paper is detailed and scientifically correct as the authors used existing research findings to explain their results 6. All the listed references are good, recent and consistent with referencing style 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The overall language quality is very simple and good as required for a scholarly article of international standard	
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:	Olumuyiwa Idowu Ojo
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria