

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124129
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Farm Mechanization Level for Groundnut Crop in Junagadh District
Type of the 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>
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.	It represents an analysis of Groundnut farmers and mechanization, in a local way it can be used to identify needs and forms of production, or the impact of energy consumption for production. But in my opinion it would only remain local.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	It shows a robust methodology for the type of analysis instrument, being carried out through structured interviews, in addition to carrying out a quantitative analysis to calculate the required energy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. Contains two formats of citations in the document (Author, year) [number]	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In results and discussion, in points 3.1 and 3.2 I suggest synthesizing the information, since it is easier to go to the table and observe the response variables. Furthermore, in these sections, more emphasis is placed on mechanization. I think the structure and writing can be improved.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Armando López Beltrán
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México