



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1 authors are suggested to check grammar errors 2 references should be updated.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1 Conclusions part is not conclusive enough.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hao Wang
Department, University & Country	Northeastern University, Liaoning, P.R. China