

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_106285
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF HYBRID-SOLAR DRYER FOR CASSAVA GRATE.
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This study mentions about development and performance assessment of a hybrid solar dryer and compares this dryer with solar and open sun drying methods with three types of cassava. Although the topic is interesting, writing of the manuscript should be revised to increase follow up the article with the comments below. As a general comment, "hybrid" is not understandable as it should be a combination of at least two types of dryers. Solar part is understood; however, solar dryer is combined with what? So, it is suggested to explain hybrid like "solar-electric hybrid". Therefore, the title and whole manuscript should be reviewed in this manner. Also, the dot in the end of the title should be removed. Abstract contains long sentences (for example the first sentence). Therefore, it should be revised. In addition, there are some mentions about quality like "without sacrificing quality of the dried cassava grate" "hybrid solar dryer is an efficient dryer for maintaining quality of dry cassava grate." in the abstract. Since there are not any quality parameters studied in this article other than moisture content, it is suggested to remove these mentions from the abstract. Structure and sub-sections should be revised according to the guidelines of the journal. Key contribution part should be removed. Results and discussion should be combined together. Zeros should be removed from the titles like "1.0 INTRODUCTION" should be "1.INTRODUCTION". Some sub-titles can be combined in "2.1 Description of the hybrid solar dryer" to increase the follow up like from 2.1. to 2.5 since they are all parts. Sub-titles of 2.6.1, 2.6.2, and 2.6.3 can be removed since they are all related to design. Similarly, 2.9.1, 2.9.2, 2.9.3, and 2.9.4 should be removed and given under the title of performance. Yes, however, the results should be substantiated and compared with more literature information in the results and discussion part. The latest references are from 2022, and 2020. It suggested to check the ones from 2023. Keywords should be checked, evaluation, temperature, variety are not appropriate. Performance, solar dryer should be added. Moisture loss unit is given kg, should be kg/kg Information about the cassava types should be written in Materials & Methods part and purchase information should be added as well. Units should be checked, and should be uniform throughout the manuscript, for example hour is given as hr and h. Tables and figures should be mentioned appropriately through the manuscript. For example Results should not be started with Table 2. In materials& methods, there are not any names or brands, should be added. There are statistics as can be seen in Table 2, so software used should be added to Materials & Methods part. I could not see the number of replications, should be added and mentioned in Materials & Methods part. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Language should be checked since there are long sentences, and it decreases the follow up. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suzan Tireki
Department, University & Country	Ozyegin University, Türkiye