

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_115062
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Dimensional Variations in Commercial Cultivator Tines and Reversible Shovels in Comparison to BIS Norms
Type of the Article	

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<p>Importance for the scientific community: Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly for agricultural engineers, researchers, and manufacturers involved in the design and production of farm machinery. It addresses the crucial issue of discrepancies between commercially available cultivator tines and reversible shovels and the standards set by the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS). Understanding these variations is essential for optimizing equipment performance, reducing costs, and ensuring the reliability of farm machinery.</p> <p>Suitability of the title: The title "Study on Dimensions of Commercially Available Cultivator Tines and Reversible Shovels: A Comparison with BIS Standards" is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the article. It clearly indicates the subject matter and the objective of the study.</p> <p>Comprehensiveness of the abstract: The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including its background, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. It effectively summarizes the key findings regarding the dimensions of cultivator tines and reversible shovels compared to BIS standards. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the implications of the findings for agricultural machinery manufacturers and farmers.</p> <p>Appropriateness of subsections and structure: The manuscript follows a logical structure with clearly defined sections, including Introduction, Material and Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. This structure is appropriate for presenting the research process, findings, and implications in a systematic manner.</p> <p>Scientific correctness of the manuscript: The manuscript appears scientifically correct as it presents empirical data obtained through measurements and compares them with established standards. The methodology used for data collection and analysis is sound, and the results are discussed in relation to existing literature and standards.</p> <p>Adequacy and recency of references: The references provided cover a range of relevant topics related to agricultural machinery, including standards, testing procedures, and optimization. However, the references could be expanded to include more recent studies on cultivator design, optimization techniques, and the impact of equipment dimensions on agricultural productivity.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Suitability of language/English quality: Overall, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and technically sound. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for better readability and comprehension.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>In conclusion, the manuscript addresses an important issue in agricultural engineering and provides valuable insights into the dimensions of commercially available cultivator tines and reversible shovels compared to BIS standards. With some minor improvements in language and referencing, the manuscript could further enhance its contribution to the scientific community.</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:	Metin Güner
Department, University & Country	Ankara University, Türkiye