



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42187
Title of the Manuscript:	Elaboration of an open source prototyping platform for salubrity monitoring in agricultural machinery
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>)



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	The paper is very interesting and I would like to congratulate the authors on achieving the goal that is the prototype for monitoring the tractor cabin conditions at a really very small cost. Despite the above, I am afraid that the paper in its current form is not publishable. It would need some major changes, which I think are worth doing, as indeed the results are publishable and worth an effort. There are few major problems related to the way the paper is written. 1. The paper looks like a technical report rather than a research paper. The paragraphs are very short and a bit disjointed. It would be much better to have some of those paragraphs connected to each other so there is a flow in the text. 2. There is practically no literature review, despite some references listed at the end and referred to in the text. However, the reference to the literature is done only for Arduino as a microcontroller board and some sensors. There is information whether a similar platform has been developed before, what it measured, what it used as sensors etc. I am sure that such platform do exist and should be reported in the paper and compared with the one designed. 3. Referring to a source in the form '[18] state that...', '[16] and [17] recommend using ...', '[20] recommend ...' is not really acceptable. 4. In the Introduction there are several factors (classified as (a) and (b)) given as risk factors. The investigation concentrates on three only; why those three? Are those the most important ones? The easier one to measure? 5. The Abstract should be rewritten as the sentences there are 4-5 lines long and difficult to follow. Also, the impression the abstract gives is that the emphasis is on comparing two sets of data (called databases?) whereas the main issue here is to design a platform and data comparison is used as a tool to make the platform measure properly, by using it as a way to calibrate. 6. The objectives of the work should clearly stated and reviewed in the conclusions. There are also a few minor issues as listed below, which indeed require some attention.	The authors agree with the reviewer and have made the suggested corrections.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The Tukey test becomes later in the text 'Turkey test', needs to be corrected. 2. No reason for giving the coordinates and altitude of the lab location. 3. Noise level measured in dB, which dB, A, B, C or D? 4. Under 2.6, line 197 there is a statement '... will be adjusted' – I suppose that refers to the fact that the following text explains that calibration curves adjustment, but that should not be in the future tense. 5. Tables (all, 1, 2 and 3) refer to equipment A and B, but it is overdone, as there is a column for the equipment and again A and B is repeated in other columns.	The authors agree with the reviewer and have made the suggested corrections.
Optional/General comments	Apart to the comments above there are a few language problems which should be attended to.	