

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123636
Title of the Manuscript:	ENGINEERING PROPERTIES OF FOXTAIL MILLET SEEDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BULLOCK DRAWN PLANTER FOR MILLET CROP
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it highlights the importance of seed engineering properties, such as size, shape, true density, bulk density, frictional properties etc., in planter design. These properties impact seed flow and placement accuracy, crucial for improving crop yield. I appreciate the manuscript for its relevance in advancing precision agriculture and enhancing planter performance.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is relevant but could be more focused. Since the paper primarily discusses the engineering properties of foxtail millet, the mention of 'bullock drawn' is unnecessary. A more concise title could focus on the engineering properties of foxtail millet seeds for the development of a planter.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the engineering properties of foxtail millet seeds, but it could be more focused. Since the paper does not include the actual design of the planter, it would be better to clarify that the study only covers the engineering properties, which are essential for planter development. Removing or rephrasing mentions of the planter's design would improve clarity.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure is appropriate, but the lack of a literature review on millet crop engineering properties is a significant gap. Previous studies on seed size, shape, density, and frictional properties are crucial for designing planters. Including a literature review would provide important context and strengthen the relevance of the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it accurately measures key engineering properties of foxtail millet seeds, such as seed dimensions, densities, and frictional properties, which are crucial for designing effective agricultural machinery. • The methodology used for these measurements is appropriate and relevant. However, the manuscript lacks information on the moisture content at which these properties were measured, which is an important factor influencing seed behavior and planter performance. • Additionally, the formula used for calculating the geometric mean diameter appears to be incorrect and needs to be revised. Addressing these issues would enhance the scientific completeness and applicability of the research. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The results section would benefit from additional references that specifically address the use of these engineering properties in the development of planters. Moreover, the inclusion of more recent references would strengthen the manuscript by providing updated insights and supporting the relevance of the study. Adding relevant and current references would improve the overall quality and context of the research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>ok</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The lack of information on moisture content and the incorrect formula for geometric mean diameter should be addressed to enhance scientific accuracy.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Bangale Rashmi Anilrao
Department, University & Country	ICAR-CIAE, India