



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_45354
Title of the Manuscript:	Biomechanical Evaluation of Urban Pruning Activities
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 author(s) tried to evaluate the working quality from biomechanical perspective in order to improve the working environment of the labors. The author(s) first analyzed the posture using the OWAS method measuring the cycle time of each posture state and the repetition, then calculated mechanical stress on vertebral disc using a software named 3DSSPP in order to evaluate the risk of injury. Although the reviewer agrees with the importance of the studies, current manuscript has several serious lacks and incompleteness, that prevent readers to evaluate adequately. For example, the lack of the definition of action categories of Table 3, broken link at reference web page for the OWAS method, several erroneous/strange numbers/data. As a result, although the reviewer can conclude the manuscript may be able to have a quality published in future, thorough improvement and recheck of data and manuscript is mandatory. L 26-30: "There are different types of pruning techniques, pruning of formation that is used to direct the development of the crown according to the conditions of the planting site, the pruning of maintenance that has the purpose of eliminating branches that may facilitate the occurrence of xylophagous elements and safety pruning to remove branches that may cause an accident." ... The sentence is quite difficult to understand clearly. Similar problems are found in the manuscript; those should be improved. L65 (Table 3): Although the categories are fundamental in this study so that the main result bases on them, there is no explanation of the categories. L219: I tried to refer to the web site at 7th reference wondering the categories; however, the web site was not found. L88 (Table 4): There are very similar "T (time)" values at similar "Posture" categories. I wonder the author(s) are categorizing one operation into multiple "Posture" categories. I'm not sure such data process is permissible in the study field; however, there are no explanation on it despite it is mandatory. L.161: "a value of 3.534N, which is higher than the value of 3,426.3N" ... 3.534<<3,426, but it may be a mistake. L.162: "... 3,426.3N, which is the maximum limit recommended by the software so that there is no risk of injury." ... But Table 9 is indicating "No risk of injury"	L 26-30: accepted suggestion L65: The used site is unavailable. In this way, we remove the link from the manuscript L88 With regard to the postures, the positions visualized during each activity and later definition were quantified of the standard postures (the most found in each operation). L.161: Values are close in this way, they can not state the risk, however the risk may occur. Suggestion accepted in the course of the article L.162: Accepted suggestion
Minor REVISION comments	L.143: "[9] evaluating ..." ... The author(s) should be placed before the reference number	L.143: Accepted suggestion
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	