

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_105420</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of mass-indices (B-values) of selected legumes, tuber and sea food for utilization in minimum energy and power expressions for mass-size reduction operations.</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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. It is important. But my worry is that how can we compare crops with different physiological and morphological characteristic. How are/is the authors of this article treat statistics? Needs strong justification</p> <p>2. The Title is too long. Maybe it can shorten as: - Mass-indices (B-values) of legumes, tuber and sea food for mass-size reduction operations.</p> <p>3. In short summarize the purpose, methodology, result, and conclusion in the abstract. The key word is all from abstract. Reconsider again</p> <p>4. Please clearly put the objective of this study in its appropriate? I am not sure why the formulae and the theory are put in the introduction. It would have been better if they are incorporated in the methodology section.</p> <p>5. With so many mistakes. Hammering is needed. A research article is not just a paper that you send to any journal? You have to think, think, right, re-right. Need precautions before you send to a journal.</p> <p>6. It needs major improvement. Small and tiny mistakes raise doubts about the quality of the work. Therefore, authors need precautions when submitting papers.</p> <p>7.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	It is OK.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The article needs further refinement, Justify the importance, significance, and relevance including its replicability. This are the measures of a good quality article.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Hailu Regassa Bedane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Collage of Natural and Computational Sciences, Centre for Environmental Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia</b>