



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_26627</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Design and Development of an Improved Palm Kernel Shelling Machine and Separator</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paper is not publishable in the current form; there are several deficiencies both in the paper structure, its concept and also in language, figures, calculations and editing.</li> <li>• The title of the paper is 'Design and Development of an Improved Palm Kernel Shelling Machine and Separator'; hence it is only logical to expect that the paper will start with the introduction on the current machine which is to be improved. Unfortunately, it does not happen.</li> <li>• Paper fails to describe properly new design and the difference between the current machine and the new one.</li> <li>• It talks about efficiency of the 'existing (imported) machine' and about simplifying the machine, but actually does not describe the machine and changes (page 3).</li> <li>• The figures are mainly not referred to in the text.</li> <li>• The text does not indicate anything about the stress analyses however there are some figures with the results.</li> <li>• . There are 2 heading called conclusions, one at the end of the main paper and the second at the end. That does not seem logical.</li> <li>• The major problem is also that it is not clear which part of the paper is done by authors and which part is coming from the literature. I am referring to the part related to experimental procedures (page 6). The paper describes the procedures and results but quotes some references, so is it the own work by authors or not? That</li> </ul>	Made necessary modifications as suggested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>applies to physical characteristic, size mass and coefficient of friction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The paper sometimes pretends to be a textbook talking about general issues like slipping in the belt drives, gear system being kinematically equivalent to frictional wheels etc. (page 5). There is no reason to do that in the research paper.</li></ul>	
--	--	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tables in the paper are called figures, and they are not referred to in the text. There are two Fig. 1s.</li> <li>• The calculation for the peripheral velocity of the hammer mill uses the radius 0.15 m whereas the data for the cracking unit shows the radius at 35 mm.</li> <li>• The calculations are too long and not clear by using sometimes small and sometimes capital letters for certain parameters. Also, the use of word 'strength' on page 7 is questionable; what is actually meant by 'strength'?</li> <li>• The heading Limitations lists 'power failure' which resulted to production downtime and increase in cost of fabrication. But no cost is calculated/listed in the paper. It may have been a nuisance to the authors but I cannot see any value of talking about it in the research paper. The same applies to the second limitation on 'getting the machine to the end users', there is not a single reference in the paper on distribution.</li> <li>• The paper is difficult to read as (may be in the process of conversion from the word processor into pdf) some words got 'glued' together making it really difficult to read.</li> <li>• There are also grammatical mistakes in the use of plurals (pages 1, 2, and thereafter) and some mistakes in units (like something called 'gms' used as a mass unit (page 1).</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>The topic of the paper is interesting and important. However, there are several serious deficiencies in its concept, structure, concept, language, figures, calculations and editing. I am of the opinion that it is possible to correct the paper in such a way that it will be acceptable for publication.</p>	