

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_95747</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Development and performance evaluation of a cocoa bean sheller cum winnower</b>
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community and for humanity since it solves a problem for the well-being of populations. The title is acceptable.</p> <p>In the summary, the author could highlight some specific results of his work instead of giving a very encompassing result.</p> <p>Are the subsections and the structure of the manuscript to be improved. It could number the subsections.</p> <p>For example</p> <p>1- INTRODUCTION 2- MATERIALS AND METHODS 2-1-Raw materials</p> <p>Scientifically, the manuscript has some imperfections. In the introduction, the author should be able to tell us if he is the first to make such a system, if not, mention the work of researchers who have already worked on such a system and indicate their limits. In the material and method part, it would be interesting to accompany the description of the system with an image or a diagram since other researchers could draw inspiration from it to continue and improve the machine.</p> <p>Finally, we believe that the conclusion must be improved.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>We believe that this work can be improved and published if the authors take the comments into account and restructure the manuscript</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></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>Soro Donafologo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ecole Normale Supérieure, Côte d'Ivoire</b>