

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_108305
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of Inclined Plate for seeder by Analyzing Physical and Frictional properties of Mustard Varieties
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<p>With the current content, it doesn't represent much importance to the scientific community. The content seems incomplete to give a significant message and the way of writing is not scientifically and technically sound. The flow of the content should be carefully revised.</p> <p>Design of an Inclined Plate for Seeder by Analyzing Physical and Frictional properties of Mustard Varieties</p> <p>No. The abstract is too lengthy. I recommend rewriting the abstract. Keywords are poorly written. Try more effective keywords.</p> <p>Please see the general comments</p> <p>The way of writing is not technically and scientifically sound in many places</p> <p>References are not adequate and there are some formatting errors. Specially the scientific names should be in italic</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No. The presentation quality is poor and not technically sound. The entire paper needs a careful English language/ technical editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Too much information about Mustard plant. Please reduce that content and include a summary of the content written under materials and methods. (Generally under materials and method, the author should include only the methods of conducting tests relevant to the study)</p> <p>The research objective should be described more clearly while highlighting the originality of the study.</p> <p>It's not clear why the authors selected that three specific Mustard varieties. Better to mention relevant scientific evidences for selecting these three varieties.</p> <p>Materials and methods</p> <p>The methodology section is not technically sound. No need to state additional information like background information about seeders, bulk density and true density etc. under this section.</p> <p>Methods should be written in passive past tense.</p> <p>The method of data analysis is not described in manuscript.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>Most of the results were not properly discussed and there are lots of grammar mistakes.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>In some instances, the authors have just stated “similar results were obtained by XXX”. But, it is better if the authors could further discuss the context of their results in a more scientific manner with suitable evidences from literature.</p> <p>The method of making the ‘inclined plate’ should be included under materials and methods and any observations made should be discussed under results and discussion section.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion is not scientifically sound. Please rewrite. The authors have stated a conclusion regarding the GI seeds. However, the manuscript doesn’t contain any observation to prove that conclusion.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	H.A. Rathnayake
Department, University & Country	Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka