

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102344
Title of the Manuscript:	Design, fabrication and performance evaluation of groundnut seeds dehuller as influenced by varietal differences
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, it is, but maybe it needs to improve.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, there are.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>1) References that are more than 10 years recent should be avoided or reduced. unused references should be deleted.</p> <p>2) Freeman et al. 1999 contained in the text, apparently not found in the bibliography, which is Freman 1999 which uses a single letter e, there may have been a typo that should have been Freman 1999.</p> <p>3) The Ayelegun contained in the text, it turns out, is not found in the bibliography, what exists is Ayelegum which uses the letter m instead of n, maybe there was a typo, which one should be correct?</p> <p>4) Khurmi and Gupta 2005 contained in the text, apparently not found in the bibliography, there is Kurmi and Gupta 2005 which does not use the letter h after the letter K, there may have been a typo that should have been Khurmi and Gupta 2005, here found the author's lack of accuracy in quoting people's names there are several typos.</p> <p>5) Akintunde et al, (1983) contained in the text, apparently not found in the bibliography, which is Akintunde et al, (2005), there may be a typo that should have used 2005. The author must check the suitability of the spelling of the author's name contained in the text must be the same as in the bibliography.</p> <p>6) (Spott, 1998) contained in the text, apparently not found in the bibliography, the author must add.</p> <p>7) (Pinson et al., 1991) contained in the text, apparently not found in the bibliography, which is Pinson et al., 1999, maybe there was a typo that should have used 1999.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1) Title improvement suggestions: Design, fabrication and performance evaluation of peanut seed peeler due to differences in varieties</p> <p>2) The terms in the abstract, including the keywords, should be adjusted to the terms in the revised title.</p> <p>3) In addition to the peanut peeler design, performance evaluation is also carried out, so photos of the results of stripping need to be displayed.</p> <p>4) The author must check the suitability of the spelling of the author's name contained in the text must be the same as in the bibliography.</p> <p>5) All units are separated by the stated value.</p> <p>6) (I have edited some of it, for practical reasons, e.g. separating the units from their value statements; inserting formula numbers and so on.)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syamsul Hadi
Department, University & Country	State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia