



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24682
Title of the Manuscript:	AN EXPERIMENTATION INVESTIGATION OF SOLAR ENERGY UTILIZATION FOR DRY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The description of the solar product dryer is not clear, also the Figure 1 does not clearly reflect your description. 2. If you have constructed one, then take the snapshot or draw it using appropriate software and put it the appropriate place in the work, i.e., after the description. 3. You need to rewrite the conclusion either in one or more paragraphs. Itemizing you points is not appropriate. 4. References: Majority of your references are wrong. Check the APA 6th Edition. Numbering the references is not required. Specifically, check ref no. 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19. 17 is twice. 5. Your experimental explanation and results generated are not clear. Explain clearly how you carried out the experiment that led to those results. Table 2, Table 3, and Fig 2. 6. There is no consistence in your citations, e.g., Spies C. I. H.C. Coote. (2006). It should be: Spies and Coote (2006). See APA 6th Edition. Use this to correct others. Line 61 – 64 not well-formatted. Numbering is not necessary	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 96, "chamber.as..." correct it; Line 98, 100, 101 103, 109. 111, e.g., "48 cm and others "should be corrected 48cm.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. PVC full meaning should be clearly written, thereafter you can use its acronyms. 3. Line 120, e.g., 7 .00 should be corrected. 4. check your spellings, e.g., formaiz (line 234), 5. Correct all metrics measurements, e.g., 70 ⁰ C, 70% are right. Check your work and make corrections. 5. Line 26, recast the sentence, e.g., for than 95%.... does not make meaning. Line 38 .It..... 6. Line 10 – 11, recast the sentence. 7. 37 – 47 ⁰ C is not correct. It should be 37 ⁰ C – 47 ⁰ C. Make corrections to others. 8. Line 21, collector/dryer, not collector / dryer.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The writing style is very poor. However, the author(s) should correct the work following the suggestions/recommendations and resubmit.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jackson Akpojar
Department, University & Country	Department of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, College of Basic and Applied Sciences, Samuel Adegboyega University, Ogwa, Edo State, Nigeria