

Review Form 1.8

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Archives of Current Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ACRI_120116 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Performance evaluation of direct sowing of wheat through Happy Seedercombine harvested rice fields in vertisol region of central India. |
| Type of the Article | |

[Review Form 1.8](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i> | The article entitled "Performance evaluation of direct sowing of wheat through Happy Seeder combined harvested rice fields in Vertisol region of central India", has fulfilled the terms and conditions from a research perspective, and the research results are useful for knowing the extent of the performance of direct sowing of wheat through Happy Seedercombine in harvesting rice fields, so that comparisons can be made with conventional methods, for decision making. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | In my opinion, the title given to the article is good and fulfills the research aspect. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? | Globally, the description presented in the abstract is still not specific, it is better if the description in the abstract is divided into the background of the problem to be researched, a description of the process using concepts, or comparative methods used in the research, and then a conclusion on the results obtained from the research. In my opinion, the emphasis on the abstract is the background to the research and why the Happy Seeder method is the choice in research. Further explanation is needed regarding the statement "Thus the results showed that the direct sowing of wheat through happy seeder performed better than conventional field preparation followed by sowing through conventional seed cum fertilizer drill in combined harvested rice fields.", because this statement has not been clearly illustrated and specific results obtained in research in order to improve research results, whether the results obtained have been compared with conventional methods or previous research (give a description in the form of a percentage value). | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | In my opinion, globally there is still a need for a more specific explanation of each sub-section, especially in the materials and methods sub-section, the description in this sub-section is still too global and does not show the process of data manipulation from the survey results. | |
| Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i> | In my opinion, the manuscript written is scientifically appropriate, it only needs further explanation regarding the data used and processed in the research carried out, provide a detailed description of the processing carried out using the Happy Seeder method. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. | The references provided are good, you only need comparative references from research that has been carried out by other researchers to be able to determine the novelty of the research carried out. | |

Review Form 1.8

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Please check again as a whole, especially the writing structure, thank you</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Introductory Part: It would be better if the introduction section shows the steps or stages of the research which are described in the form of a flowchart or work flow. Show the novelty of the research you conducted, as well as its relationship to previous research. A more specific description is needed regarding the relationship between survey data and the process concept carried out in research.</p> <p>Conclusion: Provide a more structured and simpler description that shows that the results of the research carried out are useful.</p> <p>The statement in the conclusion is still too global and does not show a more specific statement of results from a process carried out in the research, provide further explanation regarding the statement "Thus it can be well concluded that direct sowing of wheat through happy seeder performed better than the conventional planting in combine harvested rice fields in the vertisolsof central India region", in my opinion it is best to use percentage values to show the comparison of the happy seeder method which has better performance compared to planting using conventional methods.</p> | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Reviewer's comment</p> | <p>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> |
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Ir. Chairuddin</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>STMIK IM, Indonesia</p> |