

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_94221
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity Improvement Through Work Study Techniques: A Case of a Modern Rice Mill in Ikwo, Ebonyi State
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Comments to the authors: Authors have tried to propose a new method for improving the productivity of a rice mill. However, the authors can include the following issues to improve the quality of this manuscript.</p> <p>Comment 1: Make a production flow chart for the existing method and the proposed method to clarify the improvement.</p> <p>Comment 2: The total number of operations is the same (17) in both the existing method and the proposed method as presented in Tables 2 and 4. So, what is the improvement here? Explain</p> <p>Comment 3: The total number of manpower is the same (89) both in the existing method and the proposed method as presented in Table 2 and Table 4. So, what is the improvement here? Explain</p> <p>Comment 4: In Table 3, the critical operation "husking" is presented in the existing method. However, it is not included in Table 2, where existing operations are enlisted. Explain why?</p> <p>Comment 5: In this study, the total amount of time has decreased by only 1.39 minutes, but productivity has improved by 12.71%. This calculation is hard to understand. Show the calculation details by setting numerical data. Similarly, other calculations provide clear explanations (efficiency of 41.23%, mean productivity of 2.5 tons per day, and so on).</p> <p>Comment 6: In Table 2, it is written that most of the operations are performed manually, and the same operations are done by machine in the proposed method as mentioned in Table 4. However, the number of employees remains constant. So, what is the improvement in doing the operation using the machine? Explain.</p> <p>Comment 7: Give a space to write a numerical value and its units, such as 1.39 mins (Page 1). Modify all others in this manuscript.</p> <p>Comment 8: Make the images in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 clear.</p> <p>Comment 9: On page 2, lines no. 27 (production..... efficiency), and 42 (productivity..... profitability) must be written in the correct format.</p> <p>Comment 10: Keep a free line space before and after the heading as well as the subheading in this manuscript.</p> <p>Comment 11: Use a recently published research paper as a reference for improving the quality of the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohibul Islam
Department, University & Country	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh