



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_40525
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on physical properties of okra seed: ABELMOSCHUS ESCULENTUS (L.)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>In my candid opinion rationale for the research work is good. But, in order to improve the quality of this paper; thorough revision should be done as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was not reported so as to ascertain the effects of parameters evaluated on okra seed and their implications 2. Discussion was not mechanistic enough, practically all citations corroborated the contributors findings. Therefore, implications of the results obtained should be explicated extensively. 3. The conclusion did not support the hypothesis provided in the work. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The variation of results is given in discussion. ANOVA was not done as variables were not selected for two or more factor experiment design and hence experiment. 2. The results may appear corroborating the contributors findings, but the variety chosen by me is different. It is <i>Varsha Uphar</i>. 3. The conclusion is as per the work done in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments 1.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have reservations with formulae included in the paper, seems not readable enough and should be re-written. 2. I noticed that results and discussion as well as conclusion were numbered, I don't know, if it is the style of the Journal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All formulas are typed in MS Word 2013 and saved in docx file. When you see them in old version of MS Office, then it might be unreadable. Kindly bear this difference or use MS Word 2013. I'm attaching a snapshot that formulas are typed and editable. 2. This style is good as it clearly explicit the different results. This format of conclusion is also used in old similar research papers.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>MANUSCRIPT FEATURES</p> <p>1. Originality of the work Marginal</p> <p>2. Engineering relevance: Acceptable</p> <p>3. Scientific relevance: Good</p> <p>4. Completeness of the work: Marginal</p> <p>5. Support of the work by other references: Marginal</p> <p>6. Organisation of the manuscript: acceptable</p> <p>7. Clarity in writing, tables, graphs and illustrations: Good</p>	<p>Shape</p> <p>The shape of seed is important design parameter of flow structures and metering mechanisms. The shape of the seed is expressed by its roundness and sphericity. Roundness of seed, R_p is calculated by formula [11]:</p> $R_p = \frac{A_p}{A_c} \times 100$ <p>where, R_p = Roundness, % A_p = Projected area, mm² A_c = Area of the smallest circumscribing circle, mm²</p> <p>The projected area of the seed was measured using a testing setup which included a thirteen megapixel camera, glass slab, camera stand and graph paper. Experimental setup used for this is depicted in Fig. 1.</p>
---	--	---