

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Current Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOCR_12586</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development and Demonstration of a Manually Operated Sugarcane Mother Shoot Cutter</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>The study is important for the sugarcane production industry.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title is suitable for the study!</b>	

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>The abstract miss the statistical comparison and the signifact results.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>After carefully reviewing the manuscript, I have a few critical concerns that I believe need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no clear evidence to support the results. The study lacks statistical tests to validate the findings, and no significant results have been presented.</li> <li>2. Figure 4 does not demonstrate any significant difference between the tool and manual methods.</li> <li>3. In Table 2, the Days After Planting (DAP) differ, which could potentially influence the results. However, this factor has not been adequately addressed. What if the DAP is affecting the outcomes? This remains unclear.</li> <li>4. The manuscript does not provide sufficient details about the locations of the experiments. Key factors such as weather conditions, soil type, and terrain characteristics could have impacted the results, but these aspects have not been discussed.</li> <li>5. Additionally, there is no mention of the experimental design used in the study. This information is crucial for understanding the methodology and evaluating the reliability of the findings.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>There are ok</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, but need to add more statistical terms and show stander errors!</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<p><b>The study is weak because of the lack of statistical methods. Need to compare the results in a scientific way using statistical method and software. Need to compare the results in a scientific way using statistical method and software.nov</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rabia El-hawaz</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Clemson University, United States</b>