

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_124914
Title of the Manuscript:	Creation of a Robotic System for Weed Management in Greenhouse Cucumbers
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Information is very relevant from time immemorial more so in modern times. A specific application has been chosen.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title can be fine tuned. In modern days greenhouse refers more to gases which need to be reduced. So the word greenhouse cucumbers seems appropriate especially at a time when the world focuses on controlling greenhouse gas emissions	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Acceptable	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some contents are missing. Some have too much unnecessary elaboration with mistakes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientific correctness is lost owing to wrong usage / missing symbols. E.g. Usage of Esc and tilde symbol $\sqrt{ V_r ^2 + r_u ^2}$ Vv = Vbv Units are missing in some parameters like FG Rotation etc	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of references are very ols.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Too many grammatical errors are there in the manuscript which distorts the meaning. Besides, there are many ambiguities. Apart from that some sentences start with And making things inappropriate for publishing in a good journal. Sentences like The first point in design of this device was movement method in the greenhouse Are ambiguous. Besides, inappropriate abbreviations and mentioning of information informally cannot be acceptable in a journal paper. Sudden appearances of capital letters in between A few inappropriate usages are shown below : Spelling of meter - metre We've tried to min	
Optional/General comments	Not fit for publishing in a journal.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S Krishna Anand
Department, University & Country	Shridevi Institute of Engineering and Technology, India