

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124432
Title of the Manuscript:	AVENUES OF MECHANIZATION IN COTTON CULTIVATION
Type of the Article	Review 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>This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of agricultural engineering, cotton production and mechanization. The exploration of cotton mechanization is critical in addressing labor shortages, cost reduction and improving crop yield. The manuscript offers valuable insights into how the adoption of mechanized practices in cotton farming can enhance productivity, reduce costs and improve cotton quality. It also highlights the challenges faced by Indian farmers due to limited mechanization and suggests potential solutions for these challenges. Overall, this study contributes significantly to the ongoing discussions about agricultural modernization, especially in developing nations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate. It can also be slightly more specific to emphasize the core focus on mechanization in cotton farming in India. An alternative title could be: "Mechanization in Cotton Farming: Addressing Labor Shortages and Enhancing Productivity in India".</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 is generally comprehensive but could benefit from slight revisions. It clearly outlines the importance of cotton mechanization, the challenges faced by Indian farmers and the potential benefits of mechanization. However, it might be helpful to briefly mention the specific types of mechanization (such as cotton pickers and strippers) that are explored in the manuscript, as well as a more explicit statement on the impact of mechanization on overall productivity and profitability. The abstract could be slightly restructured to provide a clearer flow of ideas, starting from the importance of cotton globally, then moving to mechanization's role in improving yield and profitability. Adding these points will provide a clearer overview of the manuscript's scope and findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate and logical. The manuscript follows a well-organized format, covering the introduction, challenges, the need for mechanization, benefits and future implications. Each section builds upon the previous one and provides a cohesive narrative that supports the overall argument for mechanization in cotton farming. No major restructuring is required.</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. It presents a thorough discussion of the need for mechanization in cotton farming, supported by relevant data, statistics and case studies. The comparison between manual and mechanized processes, as well as the impact of mechanization on cost reduction and productivity, is well-documented. The manuscript uses credible sources to back up its claims and provides practical recommendations for future advancements. The scientific methodology is appropriate and the conclusions drawn from the data are logical and justified.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>While the manuscript is well-referenced, some citations are relatively old (dating back to 2010-2013). To strengthen the manuscript, updating the references with more recent studies from the past five years would be beneficial. Specifically, research on low-cost cotton harvesters, such as knapsack cotton pickers and pneumatic cotton pickers, which are more likely to be acceptable among smallholder farmers in India, should be included. This would provide a more contemporary and practical perspective on mechanization options suited to the Indian context. Additionally, data or studies related to the most recent advancements in agricultural machinery in India, especially those focusing on smallholder-friendly, cost-effective harvesting solutions, would add significant value to the manuscript and enhance its relevance to current industry trends.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is well-suited for scholarly communication, demonstrating clarity and coherence throughout. While the overall writing is strong, a final proofreading could further refine the text, ensuring consistency in citation formatting, punctuation and sentence structure. This additional polishing would enhance the manuscript's readability and ensure that technical explanations are easily accessible to a broader audience without compromising the depth of the content.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be accepted, but the manuscript needs to be supplemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "about 59% of the textile industry's raw material requirements are met by cotton" → More accurate phrasing could be: <i>Approximately 59% of the raw material for India's textile industry comes from cotton</i> in abstract. • The introduction jumps between historical data and mechanization benefits quickly. It would help to establish a more cohesive context before diving into statistics. • Data and years should be updated if possible to reflect more current trends in cotton cultivation • A comparison of the mechanization status of cotton farming in India with that of other major cotton-producing countries could be beneficial to highlight the gaps and potential solutions for India. • The conclusion could be slightly expanded to include a clearer call to action for policymakers and stakeholders in India's agricultural sector to prioritize mechanization. • The section HIGH DENSITY PLANTING OF COTTON contains useful details on HDPS but can be more streamlined. The benefits of HDPS (yield increase, compatibility with mechanization) are repeated multiple times. • The reference to "compact manual planter tailored to the needs of small-scale and marginal landowners" is interesting but could be expanded to explain the specific benefits over traditional methods. • There's a mix of ideas in MECHANIZATION IN PLANT PROTECTION (Bt cotton, sprayers, drones) that would benefit from better separation or subheadings. Focus on one aspect of mechanization in protection at a time. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>No</p>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khanpara Brijesh Maganbhai
Department, University & Country	Junagadh Agricultural University, India