



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_9433
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF A CABINET SOLAR DRIER
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	I have gone through the article, and I am having some connectivity problem in my internet because of that I am unable to upload the file, but following are the suggestions for the author; 1. The title is not appropriate 2. Show the value of transmissivity, absorbtivity, and reflectivity for the sheet and glazing. 3. Also show the points where the temperature is measured in fig 1. 4. Explain and discuss the tilt angle of reflectors. 5. Place the original experimental setup picture (it is essential for publication) 6. Once the author has shown the methodology of obtaining efficiency, then don't repeat for various	The research work is centred on the design and construction of solar cabinet dryers. So we have decided to modify the topic to read "Design and Construction of Cabinet Solar Dryers", since no title was suggested. In this work, emissivity was assumed equal to absorptivity and the value is one (1). That was why the aluminium plate was painted black so that it could give the condition of a perfect emitter and a perfect absorber of the sun's radiation. We have explained the tilt angle of the reflectors in the manuscript. The original experimental setup pictures were not available, that was why a diagram was included



SDI Review Form 1.6

	experiments, direct show the value of efficiencies. 7. Place either table or graph (Remove tables) for thermal performance. I think these comments can improve the quality of the article	to enhance their understanding and possible reproduction. We have equally effected the other suggestions you made on the article.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		