

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Current Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOCR_12590</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development and Performance Evaluation of Engine-Operated Bund Trimmer</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>
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.	The paper is very relevant to improving labour use efficiency in intercultural operations	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate	
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.	The abstract should be able to capture the whole essence of the research i.e. the background of study, knowledge gap, objective, methodology, results and conclusion I suggest the author review the abstract considering the above.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No the refs are not sufficient. There are several works done around brush cutter development, ergonomics anthropology of human etc. that can help the boost the quality of the paper. The auther should use goggle scholar seraech engine	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should review the paper in line with corrections and suggestions made in the manuscript	

**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>Bello RS</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>