

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_112859
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Power Weeder with Different Blade Mechanism in Intra-Row Weeding Operation
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>Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Yes, the manuscript addresses the important agricultural issue of weed control, which is a significant concern for farmers. The study evaluates the performance of a power weeder with different blade mechanisms, providing insights that can contribute to improving the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of weed control in agriculture.</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? Yes, the title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript, providing a clear indication of the study's focus on the performance evaluation of a power weeder with different blade mechanisms in intra-row weeding operations.</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, the abstract provides a concise summary of the study, including the aims, study area, methodology, results, and conclusion. It effectively conveys the key information and findings of the research.</p> <p>Are subsections and the structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, the manuscript is well-organized with clear subsections, including an introduction, review of literature, materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This structure enhances readability and understanding of the research.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears scientifically sound. The study follows a systematic methodology, presents results with relevant parameters, and draws conclusions supported by the data.</p> <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention.</p> <p>The references seem appropriate for the context of the study. However, without specific knowledge of the references cited, it is challenging to assess their relevance. If there are recent and relevant studies or advancements in power weeder technology or weed control methods, they could be considered for inclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical and stylistic improvements could enhance clarity. It is advisable to have a thorough proofreading to ensure precision and coherence.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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