

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_120023
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF A DOUBLE-LAYER GRAIN SIEVING MACHINE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1-The manuscript is important for the scientific community, especially within the agricultural and food industries. It addresses a critical need for efficient grain sieving technology, which has the potential to enhance productivity, reduce labor costs, and improve the quality and purity of grain products.</p> <p>2- The title "Design and Development of a Double-Layer Grain Sieving Machine" accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript.</p> <p>3- The abstract is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the importance of grain sieving, the design and development process of the machine, and its performance metrics, including capacity and efficiency.</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. It includes an introduction, detailed design and development process, performance evaluation, and conclusion, all of which are logically organized.</p> <p>5- The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The design and development of the sieving machine are based on sound engineering principles, and the performance evaluation methods are appropriately described and executed.</p> <p>6- The references are sufficient and recent. They cover relevant previous studies on mechanized sieving technology and other related topics.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, clear, and concise.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is not original, but it is a labor-intensive study. It may be better to include more detailed schematics or diagrams of the screening machine in the article to increase clarity. Statistical analysis is recommended. I recommend that the developed machine be compared with existing technologies in terms of efficiency.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Metin Güner
Department, University & Country	Ankara University, Türkiye

Review Form 1.7