

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121676
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Various Operational Parameters on Harvesting Efficiency of Developed Lathyrus Harvester Using Response Surface Methodology
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	I believe this manuscript adds significant literature in this domain as its results articulate the importance of optimizing the operational parameters of the harvesting equipment. The manuscript presents a clear methodology towards realizing this objective. However, some aspects need to be adjusted to make the article solid. I like the manuscript because it follows the scientific method of reporting the findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable. However, it could be adjusted to make it clearer. Here's my suggestion; "Optimization of Operational Parameters on Harvesting Efficiency of Lathyrus Harvester Using Response Surface Methodology"	
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 is not comprehensible enough. There is no clear definition of the problem and suggested methods to resolve it. They should consider stating why they're optimizing these operational parameters. They rather focused on the need for the harvester. The abstract should be able to communicate to the readers the application of the results from this research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections are indicated and they follow the scientific method for writing technical research articles. There are a few suggestions for the methodology section. The author should describe the experiment site, and briefly describe how the experiments were conducted. They mostly focused on reporting about the response surface methodology and forgot to mention where exactly this experiment was conducted, the procedure and data collection methods.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This article follows the scientific methodology in reporting. • It clearly describes how a technique called Response surface methodology was used in solving a particular problem. • The authors have described the trends observed from their results and this satisfies the needs of a technical paper. • The authors need to verify the optimized results by conducting a final experiment with the optimized operational parameters to ensure that these are the best operational parameters for the harvester. <p>However, they need to explain why these trends occurred the way they observed and also support these explanations with previous research work.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are recent but insufficient. If the authors address the previous comment, it'll help in adding more references to their article.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is technically sound and suitable. However, the English language needs considerable revisions and is quite a serious concern regarding the manuscript.	I recommend that the English language be thoroughly reviewed to ensure the intentions of the authors can be communicated to the scientific community.
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	George Ashwehmbom
Department, University & Country	Hunan Agricultural University, Cameroon