

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97061</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Finite-Element Method of Solution for Frame of Tractor Operated Single Row Maize Cobs Picker</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

### **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 REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community as the analysis in it saves time for new researcher for development of mechanical components</b>  <b>Yes, it is but I had suggested minor modification in it</b> <b>(A Finite-Element Method for design and optimization of the Frame of Tractor Operated Single Row Maize Cobs Picker)</b>  <b>Yes but with little modification as suggested in manuscript</b>  <b>Yes, abstract is comprehensive with minor changes as suggested in manuscript</b>  <b>Yes, it is scientifically correct but some major changes as suggested should be incorporated</b>  <b>Minimum 15 references should be kept, I had suggested to incorporate 2-3 references for similar work. Add the remaining one</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Little bit modification in English language is required	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author is confused about some key points related to designing software he had chosen Possible changes has been suggested in manuscript	

### **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)
<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>Pankaj Malkani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>IARI, DRPCA, India</b>