SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_42987**
Title of the Manuscript:	**DEVELOPMENT OF DRUDGERY REDUCING TOOLS FOR THE WORKERS ENGAGED IN FOOD PROCESSING ENTERPRISES**
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)

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. The content of the paper does not reflect the title. The development of these tools should form the major components of the work not the user acceptability 2. The paper structure is more of survey work than a research project 3. The "Subject" in the manuscript supposedly implies respondents? 4. Specific names of food processing enterprise should be mentioned e.g. food, juice, milk etc. 5. The methodology adopted for the investigation is not scientific but purely subjective which could be deceptive. The method of scoring should not be based on statements of agreement but on established methods of measuring efficiency of operations. 6. What does percentage gain score measures or represent? Efficiency of tools or operators? Acceptability? Or ? ethical issues: The paper should be reviewed to reflect the title and the comments made in part 1.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

| Name: | *Bello R S* |
| Department, University & Country | *Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria.* |