



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_45591
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of temperature on drying kinetics of Aloe vera and its mathematical modeling
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. Lines 5, 87, 79 and others where they appeared should be written appropriately to reflect the scale: 50°C 60°C, 70°C and 80°C. 2. Wherever Aloe vera appears, it should be written in italic 3. Line 81: 3600 second is appropriate 4. The Nomenclature is not necessary after the keywords. However all the variables used should be clearly defined immediately they are used in any equation. By this, one can easily understand your equations. 5. Where Tables and Figures are referred to, the Tables and Figures should be placed immediately they are referred to in paper to enhance the quality of the paper. Also, for better understanding by those who would read and use the papers subsequently. 6. Results and Discussion: The majority of the papers cited to buttress your results are too old, except Pisalkar <i>et al.</i> (2010) for aloe vera. This means you did not do enough research to reflect new and advanced research work in this field. My advice is that, you should remove the old authorities and add more recent work that supports your results. This observation applies to the entire Section: Results and Discussion. This section must be rewritten to bring out the relevance of your results/your contributions to this field.	1. Sir, I have searched other different literatures regarding drying and even consulted my professor regarding thi, from all the sources I received the same result that the unit is written at the end of the final value in order not to create redundancy. 2. Changes made and highlighted. 3. Has been changed to 1 h. 4. Changed as suggested and highlighted. 5. Changed as suggested and highlighted. 6. At the time of research that much of paper were only there.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The paper is full of much redundancy. Please read through and remove sentences that are not necessary. That is, sentences that convey the same meaning but are repeated.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	