

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_119055
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Solution to Mitigate Agricultural Worker Fatigue: Conventional method Vs. Improved Fertilizer Broadcaster</b>
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for the scientific community because it addresses the application of improved technology to reduce farming challenges such as fatigue for our farmers. Conventional technology normally poses a lot of risks to our farmers, including diseases. Therefore, applications of improved technology have numerous advantages for our farmers, including increased productivity.</p> <p>2. The title need improvement. I suggest; Mitigating farming fatigue through application of the improved fertilizer broadcaster.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article lacks key numerical data to support the findings. For example the author reported that drudgery index, which is a measure of worker fatigue and discomfort, was also lower when using the improved fertilizer broadcaster. Lower by how much?</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. They are sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is fair</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Section 2; Materials and Methods:</b> All the defined terms such as Drudgery index, Resting heart rate, Working heart rate , Cardiac cost of work (CCW) e t.c <b>need to be cited.</b></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> need to be improved with some key results from research findings</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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:	Evordius Laurent Rulazi
Department, University & Country	Tanzania