

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
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>
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.	Solar drying is a sustainable approach towards dehydration of fruits, vegetables and grains etc. In this manuscript a very preliminary work is presented. Also the parameters like drying efficiency, pick up efficiency are not addressed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As per the content of manuscript it seems to be appropriate. It is mention that "As a result of this work, a two-in-one solar dryer was designed and built." But didn't reflect from the manuscript how it is 2 in 1 solar dryer.	
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.	Incomplete abstract. The last sentence of the abstract seems to be incomplete. Needs to change the language.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very poor introduction, Language is not good at all and unable to predict what author trying to say. In abstract it is mention that "Despite this, there are very few documented solutions to the problem." But these solutions are not pointed in Introduction. Needs to rewrite the whole Introduction section.	
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.	Why dryer is tested for unfavourable period only. Also predicted drying time is assumed 4 hours. Why 4 hrs, needs justification. No caption for Fig. 4 The dryer must be tested in favourable conditions also. Author has to take atleast 2-3 trials and then results should be presented in the manuscript. The drying time is too high 10 hours as compared to predicted time of 4 hrs. So it must be tested for favourable conditions also. What exactly the authors try to present is unclear	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few irrelevant references are used	

Review Form 3

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

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:	Rajendra Chunilal Patil
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, SNJB,s LSKBJ College of Engineering, India