



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_44549
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND PRODUCTION OF PALM NUT AND FIBRE SEPARATING MACHINE.
Type of the 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>)

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>Line-41: mention physical factors of what?</p> <p>Line 338-Correct it as ARPN Journal</p> <p>Line 79- power 3.33 kW- write (details given in section 3.1.5).</p> <p>References- year of publication, sometime written in brackets, use standard format.</p> <p>Line-91- mash was</p> <p>Line 91 and 97- check style of writing equations</p> <p>Line 80- the dia of pulley are 175 and 75, line 103 - the speed ratio is 2:3, which do not match- check this</p> <p>Line 121, there is no need to use differ ref: Sharma...., the eqn (5) is also available in Khurmi....(This is suggested as the formula is not a specialized formula, it is available in any design text book, there is no need to refer another ref for this)</p> <p>Fig.1, one support notation is filled by black colour and other is not, is there any convention?, if not make them similar.</p> <p>This machine uses several bearings, authors have not written about the selection of bearings, if they have data they can include this information.</p> <p>Section numbering is not proper: Example when there is no section 3.2 need not use 3.1.1--3.1.5. directly use .3.1----3.5.</p> <p>The authors have referred the work of Ologunagba F. O., Olutayo L. A. and Ale M. O., (2010), as the title almost gives similar meaning. The authors need to write what improvements they have made as compared to this reference.</p>	Highlighted Corrections from reviewer effected accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Good work, useful machine.	



SDI 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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	