

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_95133
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Evaluation of a Palm Fruit Thresher
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:

(<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 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)	The manuscript is important for especially agricultural sector. A vast practical and theoretical knowledge has been provided. So, it is important for the community. It is suggested to give more specific word to the title. Abstract must be rearranged or rewritten and be specific according to the written manuscript. The study in the manuscript is well briefed. The references Are not sufficient and not mentioned all the references in the references section. So, it is suggested give all references in the last which have been mentioned in the citations.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript has many English grammatical errors more than 150 words showing error. It is suggested to check in Grammarly software in MS Word.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shoukat Ali Shah
Department, University & Country	Wuhan University, China