

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJA_122206</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mechanization in Sweet Corn Production: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	The manuscript serves as a valuable resource for researchers, educators, and industry stakeholders, guiding future research and practical applications in agricultural technology. It is crucial for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of current mechanization technologies, highlighting advancements and identifying existing challenges. It contributes to discussions on sustainable agriculture and food security by showcasing how mechanization can enhance efficiency and productivity	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the paper does not accurately reflect its content, as the objectives are not clearly outlined, and there is no evidence of a comprehensive literature search being conducted.	
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.	The abstract does not mention the methods used and lacks a summary of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is no interpretations and discussions of the findings considering their implications within the context of existing knowledge, while also acknowledging the limitations of the review and the quality of the evidence.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are references listed but not cited in the text, and additional recent and relevant studies should be included.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In conducting a review, the research should include at least 50 related studies to allow for a thorough comparison of the methods, techniques, gaps, and findings	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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:	<b>Jovelin M. Lapates</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bukidnon State University, Philippines</b>