

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_113680
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance evaluation of power operated chaff cutter
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript presents significant findings about the assessment of power-operated chaff cutters in relation to different fodder crops. It furnishes comprehensive data regarding key parameters, including power consumption, cutting quantity, cutting quality, and overall efficiency. These parameters are essential in gauging the efficacy of these machines within agricultural contexts. Consequently, the manuscript holds great importance for the scientific community, particularly scholars and professionals in agricultural engineering and livestock farming. 2. The article's title, "Performance Evaluation of Power-Operated Chaff Cutter," effectively communicates the study's main focus. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, as it offers a concise overview of the study's objectives, methodology, significant findings, and implications. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing a clear organization of the study. The manuscript is divided into sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, which follow a logical flow of information. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it presents detailed experimental procedures, measurements, and analyses conducted in accordance with established standards and methodologies. 6. The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and not recent. adding references from the past 5-10 years could enhance the currency of the literature review and contextualize the study within the broader research landscape 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written with clear descriptions of the methodology, results, and conclusions. The language is technical and appropriate for the subject matter, maintaining a formal tone throughout. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for better clarity and readability. Additionally, some sentences are quite lengthy and could benefit from being broken down for easier comprehension. Overall, with some minor revisions for language and clarity, the manuscript would be suitable for scholarly communication.</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:	Kumlachew Yeneneh
Department, University & Country	Ethiopian Defence University, Ethiopia