

## **SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_46574
Title of the Manuscript:	Compressive Resistance of Groundnut kernels as Influenced by Kernel Size
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

#### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed
		highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul> <li>Authors should add writing the details about practices in two plantings in order to link postharvest qualities of these two groundnuts.</li> <li>Introduction: Authors cited that the rupture of some seeds depended on moisture contents, but this research lack of information in this section.</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more rupture forces than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more rupture energy than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more def. at rupture than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more def. at rupture than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more def. at rupture than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Results: Authors should discuss that why SAMNUT 10 showed more def. at rupture than SAMNUT 11 in all size (large, medium and small).</li> <li>Discussion: From their results, authors will recommend how to handling, processing and packaging systems for these two groundnut kernel after harvest?</li> </ul>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul> <li>Line</li> <li>Line 183-184: Lack of details of this reference</li> <li>Line 229: (Gmelina arborea) change to (<i>Gmelina arborea</i>)</li> <li>Line 236: (<i>pictacia terebinthus</i> L.) change to (<i>Pictacia terebinthus</i> L.)</li> </ul>	
Optional/General comments		

## PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wi that part in the manuscript. It is m feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her





## SDI Review Form 1.6

# **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Mahasarakham University, Thailand