



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_46468
Title of the Manuscript:	Drying characteristics of bhindi thin piece on drying in a fabricated tunnel dryer
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>)



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	<p>The following comments/suggestions must be satisfied to publish it in an International Journal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English is very poor. Example: The very 1st sentence of abstract – “<u>For the storage crops, various drying process are used.</u>” This could be “For the storage of crops, various drying processes are used.” Another sentence “The experimental data were performed on different models proposed, and investigated moisture ratio.” There are so many such types of mistake. 2. For quoting the references, no unique rule is followed. Sometimes writer's name followed by year, sometimes without year. It should be uniquely written. 3. In last para of Introduction 2nd sentence, “Models for drying mechanism of crops information and temperature (Parry, 1985).” Seems incomplete; the 4th sentence “ Recently for the tunnel convection models studying (P. and S., 2002).” Is also incomplete. 4. The section 2.2, could be ‘Methodology’ not ‘Method’. No Experimental setup is shown. The schematic or pictorial view of the experimental setup must be incorporated within the paper. 5. In Methodology, it is claimed that the fabricated setup is redesigned. Why redesign was necessary? Not explained. 6. How the air flow velocity was maintained constant, not clearly explained. 7. Experiments were conducted at three different temperatures, but how they were maintained is not explained. 8. During experiments the samples were measured for moisture reduction, every 10 minutes interval. But for moisture removal, 10 minutes is very short time. Because every time the samples need replacement for next data. The experiments were repeated but how many times, it is not mentioned. 9. How the flavour and colour of the dried sample was tested? Method is not mentioned. 10. Equation (ii), defines moisture ratio, bur in the Discussion, the term humidity ratio is used. Are they same? If so, then used same terminology. 11. The caption of Fig.1, is not appropriate. The descriptions of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, are not adequate. Need clear explanation. Caption of Fig.2 and conclusion have been merged. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper needs rigorous correction before publication to Journal.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. N. M. Mizanur Rahman
Department, University & Country	Khulna University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh