

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_118482</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of snapping roller parameters on maize harvesting</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Article Review</b>

### **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>

## 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><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. <b>Yes, because the effectiveness of harvesting corn plays a role in increasing agricultural production. Therefore, the effect of snapping roller parameters on maize harvesting is important for the scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>No, abstract articles are not comprehensive.</b></p> <p>4. <b>No, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, the references sufficient and recent.</b></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>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The method used in the manuscript is not clearly visible.</li> <li>- The conclusions do not fully answer the main problems in research and further recommendations on the same topic with speculation regarding the benefits of future research.</li> <li>- It is recommended that the conclusion section describe in the research by comparing the results of previous research.</li> </ul>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pribadyo
Department, University & Country	Teuku Umar University, Indonesia