

### ReviewForm3

JournalName:	<a href="#">CurrentJournalofAppliedScienceandTechnology</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_CJAST_125013
Titleof theManuscript:	ANALYSISOF THE BARRIERS TO THE ADOPTION OF INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING DESIGN METHODS AND TOOLS IN THE AGRICULTURAL AND AGRI-FOOD SECTORS IN WEST AFRICAN COUNTRIES.
Typeof the Article	review

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that an author should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The INTRODUCTION is quite succinctly presented. Important discussions are missing and there is not much explanation on the research carried out. All in all, there is no clear interpretation of these RESULTS. The study does not represent a significant conceptual advance over previously published studies and does not extend the current knowledge on a new area. I would recommend presenting the main characteristics and the major conclusion that individualizes this research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The TITLE is a little complicated. I would propose another title, much simpler. The title of a manuscript should be concise, no more than 12 words, and should capture the main topic, the variables manipulated in the study, and/or the issues explored in the study. Is it possible?	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this?</b>	The ABSTRACT section is well-presented, relevant for this subject. The aims and objectives of the research are well defined.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The paper is structured properly (INTRODUCTION, MATERIAL, METHODS & TESTING PROCEDURE, RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, REFERENCES, etc.). But, in its entirety, the article is quite ambiguous. The INTRODUCTION is quite succinctly presented. The CONCLUSION section is quite succinctly presented. Are only technical comments, very briefly presented, without other opinions, conclusions or any remarks. The purpose of a RESULTS section is to present the key results of your research. The meaning of the results might seem obvious to you, but it is important to spell out their significance for the reader and show exactly how they answer your research questions. Never a chapter begins with a figure or a table (Table 1, Figure 1, Figure 2). They will be placed after references to them have been made. Please correct.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technical?</b>	In fact, the study is quite limited. The purpose of a RESULTS section is to present the key results of your research. It is important to plan this section carefully as it may contain a large amount of scientific data that needs to be presented in a clear and concise fashion. The presentation is limited. I believe that this interesting and current topic can be approached more precisely and more to the point. Therefore, I recommend re-evaluating the text, after which I will be able to express an opinion.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The list of REFERENCES is long and relatively well chosen. But, the writing is inappropriate, inadequate to a journal, even negligence. Therefore, this important section has numerous features. Please correct.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is fair.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In my humble opinion, the paper has no standard scientific structure and does not have an original contribution (or too few). This contribution needs to be enriched. See my above comments.	

**ReviewForm3**

**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:	<b>Imre Kiss</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Politehnica Timisoara, Romania</b>