

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96544
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of mini solar tunnel dryer and validation of thin layer drying models for pomegranate seeds
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Undoubtedly this manuscript is really interesting and must be potentially relevant for scientific community. This article evaluates different drying methods of pomegranate seeds, which is a fundamental process to achieve the medicinal properties of this fruit. The results obtained in this study validate the possibility of using a mini solar tunnel dryer, which is an equipment that can be employed at domestic level, as this equipment is cheap, has small dimensions and is portable. In some tropical countries which are relatively "poor", that kind of technique must be really useful for drying fruits and vegetables. Yes, the title is appropriate. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and is a good summary of the manuscript. Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are adequate. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but there are little details that need to be reformulated. There are no mentions to "Table 1", "Table 2" or "Table 3" throughout the manuscript, however it is necessary to include those mentions (In the same format that "Table 4", "Table 5" and "Table 6" are mentioned) The list of references cited is sufficient (11 references), but only one of them was published in the past 4 years, so some additional recent research must be included. Additionally, some references need to be reformulated. For example, the reference "Garg, H.P. and Kumar R, 2000. Studies on Semi Cylindrical solar tunnel dryer: thermal performance of collector Applied thermal and engineering. J. Renewable Energy. 20: 115-131." does not follow the same criteria from the rest, so it needs to be reformulated. The reference "Dubey, A. (...) & TV, A. K. (2021)" needs to be replaced by "Dubey, A. (...) & Kumar, A. (2021)" 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The used language is appropriate, however I advise that the manuscript should be checked for some grammar and spelling mistakes before publication. <p>Additional suggestions:</p> <p>Abstract – The sentence "The dryer can used by the farmers..." should be replaced by "The dryer can be used by the farmers..."</p> <p>Introduction – The sentence "Pomegranate (<i>Punicagranatum L.</i>)..." should be replaced by "Pomegranate (<i>Punica granatum L.</i>)..."</p> <p>Introduction – The sentence "The edible parts of pomegranate fruit represented 52% of..." should be replaced by "The edible parts of pomegranate fruit represent 52% of..."</p> <p>Introduction – The sentence "...high moisture content of the product is to be removed..." should be replaced by "...high moisture content of the product that needs to be removed..."</p> <p>Introduction – The sentence "...for drying of fruits & vegetables." should be replaced by "...for drying of fruits and vegetables."</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Introduction – The sentence “Further, the price of the mini solar tunnel dryer may also low as compared to large sizes solar dryers.” should be replaced by “Further, the price of the mini solar tunnel dryer may also be lower as compared to larger sizes of solar dryers.”</p> <p>Material and methods – The sentence “...consisted of A hemispherical...” should be replaced by “...consisted of a hemispherical...”</p> <p>When you use an acronym, you must write out the first in-text reference to an acronym, followed by the acronym itself written in capital letters and enclosed by parentheses. All the subsequent references to the acronym must be made just by the capital letters alone. Because of that, the acronyms MSTD (mini solar tunnel dryer) and OSD (open sun drying) need to follow that ruled, do there are several sentences that need to be reformulated.</p> <p>Material and methods – The sentence “The moisture ratio (MR) of the sample were also...” should be replaced by “The moisture ratio (MR) of the sample was also...”</p> <p>Material and methods – The citation “(Yaldyz and Ertekyn, 2001)” should be replaced by “(Yaldyz & Ertekyn, 2001)”. Additionally, the type and size of letter are different from the rest of the manuscript.</p> <p>Material and methods – The sentence “The drying efficiency of MSTD and OSD for pomegranate seeds was calculated...” should be replaced by “The drying efficiency of MSTD and OSD for pomegranate seeds were calculated...”.</p> <p>Results and discussion - The sentence “The drying readings were recorded during 9 AM to 5 PM...” should be replaced by “The drying readings were recorded between 9 AM and 5 PM...”</p> <p>Results and discussion - The sentence “...three models had been represented in (Fig. 5, A-F)...” should be replaced by “...three models had been represented in Fig. 5 (A-F)...”.</p> <p>Results and discussion - The sentence “...average moisture removed & average heat input ...” should be replaced by “...average moisture removed and average heat input ...”</p> <p>Conclusion – The sentence “The dryer was significantly effective (...) compare to OSD...” should be replaced by “The dryer was significantly effective (...) compared to OSD...”</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Pedro Miguel Cunha Caetano</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidade de Évora, Portugal</p>