

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_115281
Title of the Manuscript:	PLANTING AND HARVESTING MECHANIZATION ON PRODUCTIVITY, ENERGY EFFICACY AND PROFITABILITY OF POTATO PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. Yes, because effective and efficient use of energy is very necessary to increase agricultural production. Therefore, the manuscript of mechanization of planting and harvesting on productivity, energy efficiency and profitability of potato production is important for the scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the article suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Yes, the references sufficient and recent. The manuscript is quite good in substance	 1. Thanks for your nice and justified comments 2. Thanks 3. Thanks 4. Thanks for your complements 5. Thanks for your acceptance 6. Thanks
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	Thanks
Optional/General comments	The conclusions do not fully answer the main problems in research and further recommendations on the same topic with speculation regarding the benefits of future research. It is recommended that the conclusion section describe the novelty in the research by comparing the results of previous research.	Conclusions edited

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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