

### Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAEES_110494</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development of Dibble Mechanism for Two Row Operated Semi – Automatic Vegetable Transplanter</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Journal article</b>

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable as it aptly covers what the research is about and also indicates that it is actually a development.</p> <p>3. While the abstract as it is fairly comprehensive, I suggest some additions which will be captured later.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections are appropriate but a few should be included to make the write up more complete.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is correct but just some slight additions would make it better.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are fairly recent and sufficient for the nature of the work done.</p> <p>My suggestions are as follows:</p> <p>While mechanisation seeks to increase work efficiency, there is a different school of thought that it leads to loss of jobs! To help counter this notion, I would suggest that a subsection detailing the possible cost associated with this Automatic Vegetable Transplanter. Doing so will aid put this versus the cost of human labour then a case for mechanisation can be vouched for once it seems cheaper in the long run as a result of fewer time and enhanced efficiency in terms of how the transplanting happens. Equally, there could be need to address any possible hazards or dangers associated with the Automatic Vegetable Transplanter. This could help us appreciate that the idea was not just created but was in deed well thought out and worked properly to the end. Does the Automatic Vegetable Transplanter have any weak points? For example, is there a possibility that the vegetables being transplanted could get stuck in the cup and not come out forcing someone to push it through? If there is a section to mention any of such possibilities then please do.</p> <p>When such additions are made, they should <u>be added into the Abstract</u> in a sentence or so.</p> <p>Otherwise, the work is novel and impacts immensely the scientific community.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communication. The message is passed across clearly</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Denis Misiko Mukhongo
Department, University & Country	Alupe University, Kenya