

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128652
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF MILLET THRESHER
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	With growing demand for millets and government focusing on utilization and promoting millets there will be a great demand for the millets and traditionally they have been processed on a very small scale hence in future there will be a great demand for the millets processing equipment like the thresher.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is too small, there could be an alternate title like "Performance Evaluation of Motorized Thresher for Millets in Semi-Arid region"	
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.	Abstract is sufficient but should cover more points from the actual research done like what methodologies were utilized. "Results indicate that threshing efficiency for Foxtail millet, Finger millet and Barnyard millet are 97.94% 92.17% ,97.52% respectively..." Issue: Missing commas, redundancy, and inconsistent tenses.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Citations are not mentioned just provided at the end in the references section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Follow a uniform format (APA, MLA, IEEE, etc.) throughout the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Insufficient number of references to support claims. Incorrect placement of citations within the text. Improper formatting and inconsistent arrangement in the references list. Missing comparative studies in the Results and Discussion section.	

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:	Rahul Eknath Kamble
Department, University & Country	Vasanthrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, India