

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_89325
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Fabrication of Mechanical Sieve Shaker for Particle Size Analysis of Ceramics
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>- Page 2: „2.1” paragraph is marked as „1” – please consider</p> <p>- Tables 1, 2 and 3: I feel like those tables could be merged. Separately they take too much space, which is unadvised. Especially Tab. 1 and 3 would be easy to combine together.</p> <p>- Page 6: The units are written incorrectly; for example [kW], not [kw]. The text uses later on [V], but on numbering it is not abbreviated – [volts]. This should be unified thought the whole manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>- I believe that the text should be added to the manuscript (in the appropriate sections) to answer the questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the sieves of own production used (specify method of production) or are they commercially available (specify the supplier)? 2. Has any type of post weld heat treatment been applied to the frame and other parts joined in that way? This is basically an oscillating machine. Such a way of working principle combined with residual stress could cause accelerated failure of welds. How is this issue solved/taken care of? 3. How is the issue of isolating the machine from the ground solved (in terms of mechanical vibrations transmission)? 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is related to the description of the design and the production of mechanical sieve shaker. In the introduction, the Authors present this type of devices with a description and introduce the Reader to their applications. The aim of the works is to build a prototype sieve shaker , which, for the assumed design requirements, would be cheaper than commercially available ones.</p> <p>The paper is divided into many sections, each of which describes a different aspect of the functionality of the presented device. The structure of the text seems logical and understandable. Some errors related to the editing of the text can be identified. In general, I rate the article presented to me for review positively and I believe that it is suitable for publication after minor corrections.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mateusz Kukla
Department, University & Country	Poznan University of Technology, Poland