

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_123188
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Development of a Small Whole-Stem Sugarcane Harvester
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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.	This manuscript presents a serious problem in harvesting and processing sugarcane. The Authors have identified a serious NEED for an improved machine that should be solved through scientific and engineering principles. They further presented an innovative approach towards solving this problem. I Personally think that this article contributes a wealth of knowledge to scientist and practicing engineers in this field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of this article isn't suitable or consistent with the content. The Authors mentioned in the title that it is the "Design and Development ...", the Design aspect is broadly covered in the article but there's no aspect of Development of the equipment that has been designed. If the scope of their work was limited at the design Phase, then I would recommend this title " <i>Innovative Design of a Whole-stem Sugarcane Harvester</i> ". This helps to limit your scope strictly towards "design".	
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>The abstract is comprehensible. It highlights a major problem faced by small-scale farmers while harvesting sugarcane. It also compares larger machinery being used for the same purpose. Lastly, the abstract mentions that "whole-stem harvesters have poor adjustability of the cutting platform, leading to uneven stubble and high head breakage rates, making it difficult for farmers to choose the right sugarcane harvesting machinery".</p> <p>I believe the Authors should make it clear in the abstract if their research was able to solve these problems highlighted. This would make the abstract more captivating and appealing to readers that they might want to go through the whole article.</p> <p>Avoid the use of words that are found in the title of the article as keywords. My suggestion is that the Authors address this aspect.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Despite the innovative nature of this manuscript, I believe that the structure needs some adjustments. Bearing in mind that this is a design process, the authors should present their work following the engineering principles involved in the design of a product. For instance, here is a guide that can help the authors to structure their manuscript.</p> <p><i>Steps in the engineering design process are: define the problem, generate alternative solutions, evaluate them, select best solution, detail the design, design defense, manufacturing and testing, evaluate the performance, and prepare the final design report.</i></p> <p>Considering that this manuscript was strictly design, you can simply adjust the structure to include the different stages right up to design defense.</p> <p>So, with the usual Abstract, Introduction, materials and methods, Results and discussions, and Conclusions structure of scientific papers, your entire design process should be included in the Materials and methods section.</p> <p>You can describe the entire structure of the machine when your design process is completed.</p> <p>It is recommended that you add the names of the parts of the device underneath the diagram, just before the Figure Caption.</p> <p>Could you elaborate more on how the material selection process was done? How did you arrive at using Q235 Steel?</p> <p>Most if not all of the diagrams produced through CAD should be presented as results of your design process. If you restructure your manuscript as recommended above, you'll realize that this will be easy to accomplish. This suggestion stems from the fact that the product of your</p>	

Review Form 3

	design process is the 3D model generated using CAD software.	
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.	This manuscript clearly identifies a problem in the scientific community and provides an innovative solution towards solving the problem. It fits well as a manuscript that should be made available for the scientific community to read and fill the knowledge gap. The authors provided clear evidence of the product of their design process.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is technically sound and suitable. However, the English language requires some minor revisions.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	George Ashwehmbom Looh
Department, University & Country	Hunan Agricultural University, China