



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_44541
Title of the Manuscript:	MODELS DESIGNED TO INCREASE THE WORK OF REVERSIBLE DISC PLOW
Type of the Article	Original research 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>)

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Author(s) had made a valuable study on “design, fabrication and performance evaluation of fish feed pelletizing machine for low income farmers”. The manuscript can be accepted for publishing after some corrections below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After all, It should be explained as a more detailed way the working principle of disc plow. - Improved model design and tests for the work of reversible of disc plow are taken into consideration but in this study design process and the experimental works are ignored, namely, it should be added all the pictures of process to the manuscript. - It should be explained which methods is selected in order to boost strength of the material of the plow either as hardening, for example carbon releasing to the determined thickness, or coating. - It can be more worthy to calculate the shearing force between soil and plow for wear. - It should be made the comparison table for the to be hardened plow, to be coated plow and threaded plow. 	<p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.</p> <p>Information on ‘disc pillow’ has been incorporated in the revised MS</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	