

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122479
Title of the Manuscript:	Empowering Vegetable Farmers: Energy Analysis and Evaluating the Impact of a Battery-Operated Boom Sprayer
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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>
<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>The manuscript plays a crucial role in advancing the scientific community by introducing new tool “a battery-operated boom sprayer”, that can inspire further research and innovation. It contributes to the body of knowledge in its field, potentially leading to real-world applications. I appreciate this manuscript because it is well-structured, presents clear evidence, and offers a comprehensive analysis that adds significant value to the topic at hand. However, there might be areas where the discussion could be more expansive or where alternative perspectives could be considered to strengthen its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</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 of the article is comprehensive in that it effectively summarizes the key findings, objectives, and methodologies of the study. However, I suggest adding a brief mention of the study's broader implications or potential applications to provide readers with a clearer understanding of its significance. Additionally, if the abstract is too detailed, it might benefit from streamlining to focus on the most critical points, ensuring clarity and conciseness. This balance will help engage a wider audience and encourage further reading.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections are well presented.</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>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it follows rigorous research methodologies and provides well-substantiated data and analysis. The experimental design is particularly commendable; it includes well-defined protocols and appropriate controls, ensuring the reliability and validity of the results. The authors have meticulously conducted their experiments. Additionally, the interpretation of results is aligned with the data presented, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the subject matter.</p> <p>To enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and clarity, consider the following suggestion: Expand on Limitations: Offer a more detailed analysis of the limitations of the experimental design and how they might affect the results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and cover a broad range of relevant literature. However, it is important to ensure that the majority of the cited works are recent, ideally within the last 5 years, to reflect the current state of research in the field. If some references are outdated, it might be beneficial to replace them with more recent studies that offer updated perspectives.</p> <p>If applicable, I suggest including additional references that cover emerging trends or recent advancements related to the manuscript's topic. This will not only strengthen the literature review but also demonstrate that the manuscript is grounded in the latest research developments.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear, precise, and adheres to academic standards, making it accessible to the target audience. However, there might be areas where the text could benefit from minor revisions to improve readability and flow. Overall, the manuscript is well-written, but a careful review for any grammatical errors or awkward phrasing could further enhance its clarity and impact. More precision is joined in the manuscript file.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	To improve the writing of formulas in the manuscript, consider the following suggestion: Clear Formatting: Present equations in a separate line, centered, and with appropriate spacing. Avoid overcrowding equations with too much information; break them down into simpler steps if necessary. Remove the dots between equation and equation number.	

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:	Said Fadlo
Department, University & Country	Hassan II University, Morocco