

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_117003
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of the Ergonomics and Workload of Women Operators in Planting and Weeding Operations
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Some similar papers including Awasthi et al 2019 (Ergonomic and Workload Assessment in weeding operation conducted for wheat crop for male respondents) were left out.</p> <p>Additional Comments/Suggestion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not a single photograph is provided in the paper. please provide a few relevant photographs 2. The exact total number of subjects who took part in the experiment was not mentioned in the context. As per the manuscript, only 7 subjects were involved in the experiment. This won't give accurate results to conclude the experiment. Moreover, the anthropometric data should be the average for each age group. 3. Only two tools were used to compare different operations. It should be suggested that different tools be used for the same operations. Otherwise, it is obvious that less discomfort for the operator will prevail with lighter tools. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Sapunii Sebastian
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India