

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Physical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_102711</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF A LOW-COST HAMMER MILL MACHINE FOR FOOD PROCESSING</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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. The paper "DEVELOPMENT OF A LOW-COST HAMMER MILL MACHINE FOR FOOD PROCESSING" deals with the design of a hammer mill constructed from locally sourced and available material. The focus was on the analytical design of an improved compact hammer mill that employs a single-acting operation to pulverize, move and push out pulverized bulk material particles against gravity through a cyclone.</p> <p>2. The title is sufficient, but I would suggest that should contain "by using black box artificial intelligence models".</p> <p>3. The abstract generally describes the work of the manuscript well and is sufficient.</p> <p>4. This manuscript is long, at about 12 pages of content. This is due to study itself and the machine components description. The manuscript should follow the SCI paper template subsections and structure. Section 4.3. is dedicated to the CONCLUSION but there is no previous section noted with 4.</p> <p>5. The paper does not advance the field significantly but have archival value. Previous studies have shown similar conclusions as the author's research.</p> <p>6. In general, the references are reasonably up to date, appropriate, but not consistently formatted. Some references have no date (see reference 2 and 9). There are also some old references (see reference 7 and 8) but useful for this study. The introduction does not provide sufficient background.</p> <p>Please elaborate the discussion about what other authors have studied and which is the difference between their findings and yours.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The paper has good English structure, but some number coherence and other issues can be revisited. More concise language would be clearer for the reader as modified in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Section 1.2. "Aim of the Project" should be formatted as the previous sections (same font size). The manuscript should be formatted according to SCI paper template. In conclusion, the manuscript Ms_PSIJ_102711 is well presented. It could build up for further studies on this subject. So, overall, I think that, if the above comments are addressed the manuscript will be ready for publication in Physical Science International Journal.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Constantin
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania