

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126674
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Assessment of a Manually Operated Farmyard Manure Spreader
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	This manuscript presents valuable advancements in the field of sustainable agriculture by detailing the design and testing of an efficient, manually operated farmyard manure spreader. The study's focus on improving uniformity in manure distribution, enhancing operational efficiency, and assessing the environmental impact underscores its relevance to modern, eco-friendly farming practices. The meticulous performance analysis—covering factors like spreading width, uniformity, and economic viability—offers the scientific community practical insights into optimizing organic fertilizer use. I appreciate this manuscript for its contribution to sustainability and its thorough exploration of both mechanical design and agricultural outcomes. Its findings could inspire further research into accessible, cost-effective farm technologies that support efficient and environmentally conscious agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Performance Assessment of a Manually Operated Farmyard Manure Spreader," is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on evaluating the performance of a specific agricultural tool. However, it could be improved to convey the manuscript's emphasis on both efficiency and sustainability. In my opinion, a better title would be "Performance and Environmental Impact Assessment of a Manual Manure Spreader for Sustainable Agriculture." This suggestion highlights both the efficiency aspect and the ecological importance of the device, which may attract the attention of individuals interested in sustainable farming practices.	
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 of the article is comprehensive in its coverage of the study's goals, methodology, and key findings. It effectively highlights the importance of farmyard manure (FYM) as a sustainable soil amendment, describes the manure spreader's design and materials, and summarizes the performance metrics assessed (such as spreading width, uniformity, and operational efficiency). Additionally, the abstract briefly mentions environmental and economic benefits, which are relevant to the study's scope.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, as it follows a logical flow from introducing traditional methods, reviewing the literature, describing the materials and methods, and finally presenting results, discussion and conclusion. The sections titled "Existing method of farm yard manure application," "Process of manure application," and "Constraints in farm yard manure application" could be combined under a single section titled "Traditional Farmyard Manure Application Methods and Constraints." This would streamline the discussion of traditional techniques and help avoid redundancy.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by providing a thorough examination of both traditional and mechanized methods for farmyard manure application, supported by relevant literature and empirical findings. The detailed materials and methods section, including specific design parameters, experimental procedures, and performance metrics, enhances the reliability and replicability of the study. Additionally, the authors use established testing standards (e.g., IS test code) and clearly outline data collection and analysis methods, which strengthen the manuscript's	

Review Form 3

	credibility. By discussing recent advancements and evaluating the field performance of a new manure spreader design, the manuscript effectively contributes to the field of agricultural engineering.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references listed in the manuscript provide a solid foundation for the research topic, with a mixture of recent and relevant studies. Notably, several references from the last few years (such as those from 2021 and 2022) are included, which helps ensure that the manuscript reflects current trends and advancements in manure management technologies. However, the inclusion of older references, such as those from 2010 and 2012, suggests that the manuscript could benefit from a more up-to-date literature review. To enhance the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness, I recommend adding a few recent studies, especially those published in 2022 and 2023, that focus on emerging trends in manure spreading technologies or their environmental impacts.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript exhibits a clear structure, appropriate terminology, and a coherent flow of ideas, making it accessible to the intended audience. However, there are instances where sentence structure could be refined for clarity and conciseness. Additionally, some sections may benefit from proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve overall readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides a thorough examination of the topic, and the research question is both relevant and timely, given the increasing focus on sustainable agricultural practices. The approach taken is commendable, and the findings contribute valuable insights to the field.	

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:	Maria Pilarczyk
Department, University & Country	Czestochowa University of Technology, Poland