

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_127397
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and preliminary analysis of a solar dryer for flour dehydration
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides novel insights into Development and preliminary analysis of a solar dryer for flour dehydration and addresses key gaps in the existing body of knowledge. By employing No-load test load test , it offers robust and reliable findings that advance our understanding. The clarity of its presentation and the rigor of its analysis make it a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners alike. I particularly appreciate this manuscript because of its innovative approach, the relevance of its conclusions, and its potential to inspire future research in this field.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its well-structured methodology, adherence to established protocols, and thorough data analysis. The authors provide detailed explanations of their experimental design, ensuring reproducibility and transparency. The statistical techniques used to interpret the results are appropriate and robust, further enhancing the credibility of the findings. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound, with strong evidence supporting the conclusions drawn, making it a reliable contribution to the scientific literature.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>E Raghavendra Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shri Gnanambica Degree College (A), India</b>