

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128978
Title of the Manuscript:	Testing Women-Friendly Technology: Effect of an Improved Ring Cutter on Drudgery Reduction in Brinjal Harvesting
Type of the Article	

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.	The article is relevant and addresses a significant issue of work-related physical strain among women farm workers. The study is an interesting read. The findings underscore the benefits of adopting the ring cutter tool, which is evidently in reducing the physical strain in the gripping and pinching actions of the women workers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be revised to capture the specifics of the article. Drudgery, can include the strain, discomfort and loss of strength in other regions of the body. Add the context of the geographical location of the study as well.	
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 okay.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The posture analysis is missing. The article does not scientifically prove the findings about the issues with the posture (section 3.5, second paragraph). Either add a posture analysis with suitable ergonomic method or edit the article accordingly.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A journal paper requires more references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The literature on musculoskeletal disorders among manual workers especially women can be elaborated more.</p> <p>The specifications of the pinch meter is missing. Whether mechanical or electronic, which brand etc. need to be included. (sub heading 3.3)</p> <p>The number of images scan be preferably reduced.</p> <p>In section 3.8, what method was used to measure the level of satisfaction. Based on which variables?</p> <p>Discussion and limitations of the study/test sections are missing.</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:	Reenu Singh
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Management, USA