

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3142
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Rice Transplanters and Weeders in Diverse Soil Conditions
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses an important issue in rice cultivation. Mechanization options in planting and weeding operations can significantly improve efficiency and yields, but performance may vary based on soil type. By assessing how these machines function across diverse soils, this research provides valuable guidance to farmers and agricultural professional on optimal equipment selection and usage. The comparative analysis of different transplanters and weeders offers practical insights that could lead to improved designs and best practices. Overall, this study makes a meaningful contribution to advancing rice production techniques and crop management strategies.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title looks good. however, based on the content of the manuscript, the title can be given in many ways. I would have prefer <b>"Soil-Specific Efficacy of Mechanized Rice Planting and Weeding Equipment: A Multi-Terrain Evaluation"</b> .	
<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>	The abstract looks comprehensive.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are clearly defined. However, <b>if possible please add study area map in the experimental sites.</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive approach to evaluating rice transplanters and weeders across diverse soil conditions. The study appears to employ a systematic methodology, likely including controlled field trials and quantitative performance metrics, which enhances the reliability of its findings. The comparative nature of the study, assessing different equipment models in various conditions, suggests a thorough and unbiased analysis.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient.	

**Review Form2**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language is ok. Some grammatical errors are there along with spacing. Please go through it.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please explain the table 2 clearly as various machines have been evaluated.	

**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>Mukti Nath Jha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Agricultural Engineering Research Centre, Nepal</b>