



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_44513</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COMPARATIVE STUDY ON MANUALLY OPERATED ONION BULBLET PLANTER OVER A TRADITIONAL METHOD OF PLANTING</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The introduction is very pure and lacks of references. Please avoid plagiarism. Line 30. What is the line that there is inside the text? Line 44. Compared with which "other methods"? Lines 48-50 and elsewhere. Please follow SI units everywhere in the manuscript. Explain what is Rs. It is not obvious for everybody. Something is wrong with the type in line 66. This formula is yours? Also, what about the formula in line 79? What is missing hill? Shouldn't be explained somewhere? Lines 110-115: The comparison is not correct. It should be deeply revised. Check the units.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	VERY pure article. Misses introduction and methodology. It should be deeply revised and formulated. There is no reason to use sub-chapters to write just a sentence in each one of them. Also, VERY low reference!	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
<b>If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.</b>	There is 30% plagiarism according to specific software. The abstract and the introduction are almost totally copy-pasted. Complete lines!	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Efthymios Rodias</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Turin, Italy</b>