



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10593
Title of the Manuscript:	Fabrication of Energy Efficient Improvised Incubator
Type of the Article	Method 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	This paper provides fabrication details of an improvised incubator and the arrangement of facilities for continuous operation to overcome during power failure. Good work. However, the paper needs minor revision prior to its publication. The authors are suggested to correct the data in Table-3 related to performance in cooling and heating. Cumulative time will be more appropriate. The range considered in cooling and heating process is different – it is better to highlight the reason. Why temperature range in Figure-4 exceeds the range in Tables?	As suggested, correction have been made in table 3 and included in revised manuscript. The difference in the range is due change of ambient temperature and the same has been included in revised manuscript. The performance studies for heating was done upto 50 °C and results are shown in fig. 4. However, similar no. of data points were kept in table 2 (heating) and table 3 (cooling).
Minor REVISION comments	Mixing of the words (for example, coolingequipment, rangeof in ABSTRACT) should be corrected. Initials of authors in cited references (front or back to author's name) in the text are irregular. Better to delete initials of authors in the text.	The manuscript has been revised thoroughly with respect to grammatical errors and citation of references as per journal. Language polishing has been done in revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	For the case of multiple authors of the cited article in the text, at the end of the first author name used ' et. al ', which should be corrected to ' et al. '	Corrections has been included in revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Studies made in the paper are interesting and useful.	