

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_121568</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Comparative evaluation of performance of traditional method and commercially available pedal operated paddy thresher with the developed machine”</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper makes a significant contribution to the field of agricultural engineering by providing a comparative evaluation of different paddy threshing methods. It offers practical insights that can benefit farmers and researchers alike.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a concise summary of the research, including the objective, methodology, key findings, and implications. It successfully captures the essence of the study and entices the reader to explore further	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The introduction provides a thorough background on the significance of paddy threshing and the challenges associated with traditional methods. The rationale for comparing the traditional method, commercially available thresher, and the developed machine is well articulated.  The identification of the research gap is missing  The methodology section must be detailed and well-structured. The experimental setup, including the description of the traditional method, commercially available thresher, and the developed machine, must be clearly explained.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	More references should be added	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Proof reading si required.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Flow chart of the proposed research technique is missing.  The discussion section effectively interprets the results in the context of the research objectives. The authors should provide insightful analysis on why the developed machine performs better or worse than the other methods.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Raheel Muzzammel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Lahore, Pakistan</b>