

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123092
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Physical Characteristics for Precision Harvester Design: A Comparative Study of Spinach, Fenugreek, and Coriander Leafy Vegetables
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>Considering the need for automatic systems, especially in the agricultural sector, this article can be helpful. On the other hand, this version seems to have the ability to reduce the use of manpower in the agricultural sector.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I think the title is appropriate</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>In the abstract section of the article, the innovation should be clearly stated.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the manuscript, the review of the reviewed articles was not done well, and in this field, more and more up-to-date articles need to be reviewed. 2. In the innovation section of the article, it should be seriously improved and the differentiation of this article compared to other articles should be well expressed. 3. According to different climates in different places, are the sizes of all three mentioned products within the checked range? 4. Especially in the results section, it is better to present the tabular results in the form of a diagram so that the reader can better understand and make a better comparison. 5. The quality of the graphs provided is very low, better graphs must be provided. 6. 	
<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>In this article, a stronger literature review should be written and more articles should be read. In the innovation section, it should be clearly stated that what is the difference between this article and other articles? Especially in the results section, it is better to present the tabular results in the form of a diagram so that the reader can better understand and make a better comparison.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>It is better to read more articles to improve the article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language of the article seems appropriate.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Increase and improve the number of graphs and output results</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:	Reza Shahraki Shahdabadi
Department, University & Country	K.N.Tosi University of Technology, Iran