

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121625
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Rice Puffing Machine with LPG Heating System
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Results section of this article has provided the unprocessed data and observed results from the assessment of a rice puffing machine that utilizes an LPG heating system. The system has presented diverse information, including heating efficiency, product quality, energy consumption, and operating time. Visual representations of the results of the puffing process have also been showcased to demonstrate the visual excellence of the produced products. Nevertheless, there is a requirement for enhancement in certain aspects of the subsequent article.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Performance Evaluation of Rice Puffing Machine with LPG Heating System" is unambiguous, informative, and precisely represents the subject matter of the study. The text highlights the essential components: the emphasis on assessing performance, the particular apparatus (rice puffing machine), and the technology employed (LPG heating system).</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract you gave is complete and only briefly describes the most important parts of the study. It includes the study's purpose, the methods used, the most important findings, and the practical implications. However, there are some things that could be improved to make things clearer and more complete:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More clarity about the study's goals: The abstract says that the focus will be on evaluating performance, but it could be clearer about what those goals are. For example, it could say that the study's goals are to improve the puffing conditions so that they work better and produce better results. 2. Comparison with Traditional Methods: Since the study's goal is to make traditional methods better, a short sentence that compares how well the new method works to traditional methods in terms of cleanliness, cost, or efficiency could add to the background information. 3. Implications and Recommendations: The suggestion for small-scale entrepreneurs is mentioned, but the abstract could be more in-depth by going into more detail about how these results might affect the industry as a whole or where future research could go. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redundancies: The sentence "The developed rice puffing machine has greatly improved the efficiency and hygiene" could be rewritten or taken out if it doesn't make sense after the detailed results are shown. 2. Too Many Specifics: If there isn't enough room, some specific numbers (like Rs. 41.50 or the ratio of 1.45:1) could be left out of the abstract and talked about in more depth in the main text. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>I see that the manuscript still follows the structure and style of writing that is common in academic settings for a research proposal. It looks like it was translated and sent to the journal. The manuscript should be revised so that it fits better with the standard style and structure for a journal article.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Even though there is a lot of data shown, this article only shows the data and doesn't really explain what makes it happen. Please answer or correct the article as I explained below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does the performance of the puffing machine depend on how well the LPG heating system works? Is the efficiency that was measured higher or lower than that of other ways of heating, like electric heating? Why is there a difference? 2. Talk about how changes in parameters, like the temperature and pressure of LPG, affect the quality of puffed rice. For instance, does a rise in temperature lead to more puffing or better quality? What effect does this have on how much energy is used? Also, explain what happens to the final product if the proximate quality is higher or lower than what it should be. 3. Look into whether the measured energy use (LPG) is efficient for production on a large scale. Is it possible to save energy without lowering the quality of the product? 4. Talk about the problems with your research, like how the experiments were set up, how easy it is to get data, or other things that you can't control. Please suggest areas for more research that could be used to address these problems or help us learn more about how LPG-heated puffing machines work. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>5. It doesn't look like the economic analysis is complete or good; it should be based on the feasibility study.</p> <p>6. In addition to a performance test, you should also do a public or consumer acceptance test to see if people will like the product.</p> <p>7. If the suggestion for improvement goes over the page limit, it should be added to the supplementary data. such as the method, which takes too long, or the feasibility study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>There are certain references that are considerably outdated. If these references are not essential, they should be substituted with more recent ones. Additionally, this reference can be utilized to observe the methodology for evaluating the performance of a food product, particularly in terms of consumer acceptance. The link provided is: https://www.myfoodresearch.com/uploads/8/4/8/5/84855864/13_fr-iccpe-14_joelyna.pdf</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article requires improvement in grammar and writing, particularly in terms of punctuation and the use of imprecise sentences and words. Proofreading should undergo inquiry for academic editing.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The article doesn't always make it clear what it's trying to say. Some readers might not get the main point of what the writer is trying to say. Sometimes this makes it hard to understand the article's main point or important details.</p>	

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>
<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:	Abdullah Malik Islam Filardli
Department, University & Country	Diponegoro University, Indonesia