



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2014_BJAST_10593                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Fabrication of Energy Efficient Improvised Incubator</b>         |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Method 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**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <b>51- include comparative table (Size-volume-capacity) Conventional vs. Improvised Incubator (first three lines in table n. 3)</b><br><b>119- correct comma ".is"</b><br><b>146- replace the word "time " with "energy"</b>                                             | As suggested corrections have been included in revised manuscript                                                                                                                           |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>The authors made a comparison between the measured temperatures in incubators (conventional and improvised) and calibrated thermometer? If yes put in accordance in the two cases.</p> <p>It would be useful to have experimental errors of time and temperature.</p> | Yes, both the incubators are provided with the same sensor ( PT-100 )was used and same has been mentioned in revised manuscript                                                             |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | The authors' intentions are well intended for this paper. Since there are different models of BOD incubator, even smaller than the one tested (conventional), it would have been interesting to have also the comparison with the smallest model in commerce.            | The incubator used for comparison is the smallest model among the commercially available ( 6.1 cu. ft., 171 L; 10 cu. ft., 280 L; 12 cu. ft., 336 L and 15 cu. ft. 420 L)                   |