

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_81386
Title of the Manuscript:	Thermal performance assessment of a box-type solar cooker with an inclined collecting surface and kapok wool insulation
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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The paper results from quite a helpful experiment showing scientific quality. 2. This is not a novelty but a joint experiment. It would help if you emphasized your input more. 3. Language needs to be corrected. There is more imperfectness like e.g. : p.6/ row no.3: "witch." Is it "which"?	
Minor REVISION comments	4. From the literature, the maximum temperature reached with a conventional box solar cooker was about 150 °C [27]. In these results, the box cooker model achieved a maximum temperature of 155.5 °C. Is this the result of only designing a box cooker model? I think it should be more reasonable for the average of more products? 5. There's no comparative analysis to justify the claim of this paper.	
Optional/General comments	6. Some recommendations/comments (some of many others) 7. Overall, the paper is of average quality and needs improvement. The scientific novelty is unclear. I recommend a revision.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Kuo-Chien , Liao</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Chaoyang University Of Technology, Taiwan</i>