



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_43228
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF ENGINEERING PROPERTIES (PHYSICAL PROPERTIES) OF RUBUS FRUTICOSU
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>)



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	- The paper demonstrated analysis of characterization of engineering properties (physical properties) of Rubus Fruticosu. This top is important for providing fundamental information that will aid in designing modern technology for handling, processing, storage, preservation, quality evaluation, distribution and marketing. The author/s must review the manuscript carefully for word mistakes and results. As example: - America Society of Agricultural and Bioresources Engineering (ASABE) The right one is : American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE). - How do you describe The <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> products used for the experiment to be the long and short . - All these statistical software were used (Genstat, Mathlab, JMP, SAS, Microsoft excel and SPSS) and only ANOVA and linear regression were presented in the manuscript. - Engineering properties of agricultural products include physical, thermal, electrical, optical and mechanical properties. - The objective of this study is to ~~determine~~ moisture content, size and shape of <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> fruit and nuts and to establish relationship between samples size, shape, moisture content of the bio-material. - How do you know this relation without data "All the shape parameters for short fruits had non-linear relationship with moisture content except RR". - Remove section 2.4 - Move From line 94 to line 96 to the right place after section 2.3 - Need reference for " Lower percentage variation of principal dimensions of the nuts with moisture content when compared with that of tiger nut and pistachio nut could be because the cell of the <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> nuts have less void spaces and shrinking behavior during moisture loss than tiger nut and pistachio nut". No data in to sport these results" All the shape parameters for short fruits had non-linear relationship with moisture content except RR. Long and short fruits are significantly different (5%) in terms of sphericity and aspect ratio (AR) while the nuts differ in terms of AR and RR (Table 4). Moisture content had no effect on the shape parameters of the nut but significantly (5%) affected the AR of the fruit only. This result could be because the cells of the fruits and nuts are inelastic and could have less pore spaces which resulted in low shrinkage effect during moisture loss (need reference) . The interaction of both fruits and nuts are not significant (5%). Roundness had low values for both fruits and nuts studied, showing that <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> fruits and nuts are not round, therefore, the shape of screen opening for separation purposes must not be round. These results mean that the shape of outlet channel of storage facility for <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> fruits and nuts should be oblong or rectangular. The rolling nature of the fruits is an indication that agitator device is not needed in the design. Table (4) presented only dimensions not sphericity and aspect ratio. Moisture content had 3 levels for nuts and in ANOVA (Table 3), the degree of freedom is 4 and the studied moisture range of 10.2% - 25.06% wet basis (3 levels only).	Corrected ANOVA and linear regression were used in this manuscript but all other statistical packages mentioned were used for the larger part of the work for other properties that is not in the manuscript. Figure 3 and 4 showed the data



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Corrected. Table 6 shows the shape parameters
		Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Check grammar, word mistakes, and journal format style	
Optional/General comments		