

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JERR_102597 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Research and Design of Hammer Blade Crusher Crushing Fineness |
| 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>1. Yes, But this work is related to theoretical analysis only</p> <p>2. No, Stateic Design & Modal Analysis of Hammer Blade Crusher Crushing Fineness</p> <p>3. Yes, it is very comprehensive</p> <p>4. NO, > FACTORS INFLUENCING THE FINENESS OF CRUSHING > ARTICLE RESEARCH – LITERATURE REVIEW IS NOT COVERED WHICH ARE MENTIONED IN THE REFERECES. > ONLY TWO AUTHORS HAVE COVERED, BUT IN REFERENCES THERE ARE 15.</p> <p>5. INTRODUCTION IS MISSING ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL STANDARDS Static analysis of hammer blades – Explanation of figures 7,8,9 missing</p> <p>THE GAP IS VERY LARGE - FROM THE ANALYSIS RESULTS, IT CAN BE SEEN THAT THE MAXIMUM STRESS ON THE HAMMER BLADE IS 151.5MPA AND THE PERMISSIBLE STRESS ON THE HAMMER BLADE IS 430MPA, WHICH CAN MEET THE WORKING REQUIREMENTS. – JUSTIFICATION IS REQUIRED Yes, Manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. No, Journals are not appeared after 2019... Last 5 years journals are to be mentioned according to the journal standards.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>1. Completely theoretical analysis work, and just factors are mentioned for crushing of material using blade.</p> <p>2. THE GAP IS VERY LARGE - FROM THE ANALYSIS RESULTS, IT CAN BE SEEN THAT THE MAXIMUM STRESS ON THE HAMMER BLADE IS 151.5MPA AND THE PERMISSIBLE STRESS ON THE HAMMER BLADE IS 430MPA, WHICH CAN MEET THE WORKING REQUIREMENTS. – JUSTIFICATION IS REQUIRED</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: | P. Ravindra Kumar |
| Department, University & Country | Lakireddy Bali Reddy College of Engineering, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, India |