

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_101727
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Development of a Cowpea Decorticator
Type of the Article	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.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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This paper addresses the improvement in the manufacturing process of products from Cowpea. Thus, this paper helps in improving rural technology in agriculture and thus, it is important for the scientific community.</li> <li>2. The article title is less suitable. An alternative title can be: "Improving the efficiency of Cowpea Decorating Machine using selected machine parameters".</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and looks fine.</li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references are not sufficient and not recent also. If there are not recent papers concerning the case study, pls mention it. Also, add references to the methodology section to support the formulae their relative significance.</li> <li>7. There is lack of formatting in the whole manuscript which should be corrected. Also, any subheading needs an introducing statement before adding any formulae or result.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language is fine, but the comprehensibility needs to be checked again.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>More effect is to be put on the comprehensibility and the formatting.</p>	

### 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)
<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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shivam Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indian Institute of Technology, India</b>