



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23529
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Pedaled Honey Extractor
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1 Authors are suggested to add some content of application effect of the machine and comparison of working efficiency before and after application. 2 Graphs are not clear enough. 3 Introduction part authors are suggested to add more latest progress and history of the machines and related design.	Latest progress and history of the machine literatures have been added to the introduction part.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1 authors are suggested to check grammar errors 2 references should be updated.	All grammatical errors have been corrected and the references are now updated.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1 Conclusions part is not conclusive enough.	It has been re-written.