

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_109625
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance evaluation of remote controlled paddy weeder in different soils
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript titled "Performance evaluation of remote controlled paddy weeder in different soils" presents a significant contribution to agricultural engineering and crop management. The study's focus on fuel efficiency, field capacity, and field efficiency of a remote-controlled paddy weeder in varying soil conditions addresses a crucial aspect of agricultural technology. However, the manuscript could benefit from a broader context, explaining how these findings fit into the larger picture of sustainable agriculture and technological innovation in crop management.</p> <p>2. The title accurately reflects the manuscript's content. However, it could be enhanced for clarity and impact. A suggested alternative title (but not mandatory) might be "Comparative Performance Analysis of a Remote-Controlled Paddy Weeder in Varied Soil Conditions".</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the significance of these findings for the target audience and potential applications in agricultural practices (but not mandatory).</p> <p>4. The manuscript's structure, including its division into introduction, materials and methods, results and discussions, and conclusions, is appropriate and follows conventional scientific reporting standards.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with a methodical approach to evaluating the weeder's performance. However, the inclusion of comparative analysis with existing weeding technologies would strengthen the scientific rigor of the paper (but not mandatory).</p> <p>6. The references seem to be sufficient and relevant,</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication.</p> <p>However, the text needs revision on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. put a period in sentences where there is none 2. put a comma at the end of a paragraph, before the formulas 3. after a comma there must always be a space <p>I have indicated in the paper file some places where changes are necessary, but authors should check the entire text carefully.</p> <p>After corrections the article can be published.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Camilo Rodrigues Neto
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil