Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_111837**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Economic Evaluation of Precise Intelligent Cauliflower Harvester: A Comparative Study with Manual Harvesting**
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)**	**Reporting the increase of cauliflower production and the need to increase productivity and improve financial performance states the importance of the research clearly.** **The title specifies correctly the research.** **The abstract specifies the need, aim and methodology of research paper.** **Each subsection presents an idea, in the beginning separate costs are introduced in separate subsections. Review the possibility to merge subsections 2.1, 2.1.2….. in one subsection titled Ownership and Operational Cost incorporating the same general idea. Too many short subsections may seem confusing in a paper.** **The manuscript scientifically correctly refers to literature.** **The manuscript has 19 references most of which are from 2022 onwards.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is clear with short and understandable sentences.	
Optional/General comments	The idea is clearly stated, the abstract and conclusion are a summary of the manuscript. A selected sample analysis if included may improve the manuscript.	

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Besa Xhaferi**
Department, University & Country	**University of Tetova, North Macedonia**