



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_26627
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Development of an Improved Palm Kernel Shelling Machine and Separator
Type of Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper has been substantially modified and improved. However, in my opinion it still requires some improvements. It is a pity that the Author's responses to my previous comments were just in one statement: <i>Made necessary modifications as suggested</i> The paper structure, its concept, language, figures, calculations and editing were improved to acceptable level. I still struggle with the general concept that the author(s) do not want to admit that they actually re-design or improve the existing design of the machine. It would be much neater just to write it straight, describe the existing machine and list the changes, improvements etc. There are still 2 conclusions, although now one is called Conclusion Based on the Analysis. I suppose it is the analysis of the existing machine, so why not make it clear and simply make a heading 'Analysis of the Existing Machine' or 'Comparison between the Existing Machine and the New Design'? The section on the stress analysis is still not big enough. At least some information on the software used and some better comments on the stresses than just '... no sign of fracture'. The paper still continues to make the presentation like it would be a textbook. There is no reason to do that in the research paper. I previously commented at the part talking about slipping in the belt drives, gear system being kinematically equivalent to frictional wheels etc. (page 4) – that part is still in the text. Another example is on page 3 just before Table 1, about the selection of the material where several parameters are listed (with some dubious use of capital and small letters, but actually none of the factors are referred to are later developed in the text. 	<p>It was listed in the text in the second paragraph that this machine is an improvement of existing machines and the peculiarities of this machine was listed</p> <p>Conclusion based on the Analysis has been changed to Analysis of the Existing Machine</p> <p>According to the other reviewer, that section has been deleted</p> <p>That part has been deleted from the text</p> <p>The dubious use of capital letters have been amended Thanks for all the noted corrections to make the paper better and accepted.</p>