



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

C

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48113
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental Investigations of Problems of Drift in Aerial Spraying
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The author appears to produce unguided research manuscript without consultation to templates or previously published papers.. most of standard manuscript practices are missing. Every section/segment is problematic. grammatical errors were uncountable and heavy editorial work may be required to get it right. No proper line and centre, figures and tables are unorganised, bullet points all through the manuscript, equations without equation editor, use of two types of column etc.</p> <p>Line 1: correct title "Experimental investigation of problems of Drift in Aerial spraying" Line 2: move abstract towards left end not at centre Line 8: incoherent..plz correct line 11/12: incorrect...plz rephrase Line 14: keywords is one word section 1.6/1.5/1.4 was in another language....what was the meaning of that? plz transcribe. this is english based journal line 17/44: incoherent and badly written...Plz remove immediately and produce it as footnote below page 1 &amp; 2 Line Line 48/180: Its messy. from line 48-180 is called introduction and consist of what is known, what is unknown and what is about to be known. and should not exceed 500-700 words maximum. You had over 1000 words which is way over normal paper. Scientific publishable manuscript should not have bullet points in introduction. plz kindly remove all of them. Also introduction is never in subsections...subsections are only allowed in Mat and Met or results and Disc. Line 175/165/166/150: Your citation style especially the above listed should not be so....badly written. please download a 2019 published paper from JEAI and strictly follow the citation. Line 210/184: badly written experimetals. filled with cliché...numbers are separated from units eg 20.0 g and 20 %. Line 212/261. no line and centre, no aligning of text, was line 228 part of line 226? everything is wrong in results and discussion. from tables, to figures cramped together, to creation of subsections up to 10.0 ?, to unneded bullet points, to artificial spaces created between figure and text to naming of figures and tables, to changing paper from one column to two column style to use of bullet points, grammatical and editorial errors</p> <p>inference should be part of conclusion or remove it. conclusion should not have numbering. recast all sentences in conclusion</p> <p>I do not understand the references and referencing style. It should be completely overhauled. Maintain one citation and referencing style. references are too old replace many of old ones with recently published papers.</p>	<p>About references: Yes you're right, in the bibliography only 7 articles are dated from 2000 to recent times. There are some interesting works written mainly by Teske M.E, Thistle H.W and his cowriters like: Teske M.E, Thistle H. W. 2004. "Aerial Application Model Extension into the Far field" (Biosystem engineering, 89(1), p.29-36. up to Teske M. E., Thistle H. W., Riley Ch. M., Hewitt A. J. 2016. "Initial Laboratory Measurement of the evaporation Rate of Droplets Inside a Spray Cloud". Tran. of ASABE 59(2), p. 487-493. I know 7 papers of Teske M.E. and his cowriters, that are mainly connected with theoretical problems or laboratory experiments. The main development of agricultural aviation came in 70s, 80s and 90s, what can be clearly presented on graphs. In this time took place the largest amount of theoretical and experimental works, mainly in UK (Cranfield-Silsoe), DDR (Leipzig, Kleinmachnow ), Holland (Wageningen), Poland (Olsztyn, Mielec), USSR (Krasnodar), the big Instytut of Agricultural Aviation. Most of the works after that develop and complement this research (for example AGDISP ), which is why I decided to cite those works. Introduction has been shortened to about 850 words. I assume further shortening of this part of the paper would result in unintelligibility of this part of the paper.</p> <p>Overall size of agricultural aircraft treatments</p> <p>Number of agricultural aircraft</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript.