



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44513
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY ON MANUALLY OPERATED ONION BULBLET PLANTER OVER A TRADITIONAL METHOD OF PLANTING
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

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	<p>None of the references is cited in text. In fact, the paper introduction has no bibliographical references. No previous research citations are present as should be expected in the 'introduction' and in the 'results and discussion'.</p> <p>The main objective of the research should be explicit at the end of 'introduction', which does not occur.</p> <p>No data about the onion field is presented in 'material and methods': size, dimensions, topography, soil type and state, cultural practices prior to planting operation. Therefore, it is inaccurate to conclude regarding timeliness of operation and field efficiency.</p> <p>The method employed to assess missing hill percentage should be described.</p> <p>The paper lacks a technical description of the machine tested.</p> <p>The results are insufficiently discussed and are not compared with other studies.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 31: there is an unexpected horizontal line crossing the page.</p> <p>Line 36: there are two dot after word 'method'.</p> <p>Line 42: how big are 'small onion bulbs'? The text is empirical, lacking quantitative technical information. What is the bulbs mean size?</p> <p>Line 44: 'compared with other methods'. These methods should be thoroughly described.</p> <p>Line 49: km and not Km.</p> <p>Fig. 1: chisel and not 'chisesl'.</p> <p>Fig.3 and Table 1 are called in previous text.</p> <p>Line 118: 'Table 1 Calculation of cost of calculation...', there is a mistake here.</p> <p>Fig. 4: the unit for timeless of operation axis is mistaken. One can read that machine plants 42.4 ha/h, which is the field capacity of a very large planter.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The monetary values would be more broadly understood if US dollars or euros were used instead of rupias (Rs).</p> <p>It would be of great value to the reader to know the onion planting machine. Therefore, I suggest including a photo or layout showing this machine.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ángelo Vieira dos Reis
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Pelotas, Brazil