



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_39098
Title of the Manuscript:	Training, on farm demonstration, evaluation and maintenance of Agricultural farm machineries in western zone of Tigray, Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Short Communication

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is understood that the training occurred at the said location but I have a few comments: 1. No mention of technical characteristics (dimension, field capacity, fuel consumption, speed etc.) of the various agricultural machinery you trained the participants on was made. 2. Figures were not numbered and well referenced in the text. 3. The results did not give any information on exactly how many participants had hands-on experience (could operate the various machinery) after the training. 4. I was wondering how you were able to know the problems in the zone without using any formal method of inquiry. 5. Personally, I think this report was poorly written and more is required to bring it to an acceptable standard. SUGGESTED REPORT FORMAT: Introduction *Mechanization defined, Importance of mechanization *History of agricultural Mechanization in Ethiopia *Constraints and Potential of agricultural mechanization Materials and Methods *Study location *Number of trainees and trainers and level of expertise etc... Results and Discussion *Various trainings and number of participants who could operate the different machinery *Issuing of Certificates to deserving participants * Conclusion and Recommendation *There's always an evaluation session after every training workshop to see if participants were impressed with the event or otherwise. I think that you could put (if that results is available) it into the work to make it better. At least it will guide in future workshops. Well, I think the write-up didn't follow a lot of article writing ethics. No citing of figure numbers, repeating conclusions as Abstract etc.	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Look out for this article and pick some few points there to help make your work better especially on potential and constraints. S.K. Amponsah, P Oteng-Darko, F Kumi (2012). Potential and constraints of agricultural mechanisation in Ghana—a review. International Agricultural Engineering Journal 21 (2), 38-43	
----------------------------------	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Shadrack Kwadwo Amponsah</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>CSIR-Crops Research Institute, Ghana</i>