



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_57814
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Process Variables on a Rice De-stoning Machine
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is well structured containing all the desired parts. I make just one observation, related to the expression "little impact", which is written repeatedly and in sequence. I suggest, if possible, that the authors rewrite this part of the abstract also using the expression "little effect".</p> <p>In the description of the materials and methods I suggest that the authors present the table of the experimental design containing the 20 runs, as it was not clear whether the tests at the axial points were performed. Since the axial points of the planning are those that allow the adjustment of the second order model.</p> <p>There was no description of the methodology used in determining the response variables (tray loss (%), impurity level after separation (%), rice separation efficiency (%), stone separation efficiency (%), and capacity of the machine (kg/h)</p> <p>Regarding the Tray Loss and Rice Separation Efficiency of a Rice De-stoner responses (Table 1), the authors observed a non-significant F value, significant lack of fit and a low R<sup>2</sup> value (0.713). These results imply that the model did not show adequate adjustment to the experimental data, so the model is not significant and predictive of the process. Thus, equations 2 and 4 are not valid. Likewise, the response surfaces (contour plot) must also not be generated.</p> <p>In the analysis of the Rice Separation Efficiency of a Rice De-stoner, a Table 3.3 was cited which was not found in the article. Another inconsistency is related to the p-value, which is shown as not significant in Table 1, but in the discussion it is mentioned as significant.</p> <p>Regarding the discussion about Machine Capacity of a Rice De-stoner, there was an error regarding the effect of the moisture content variable, which was considered in the text as not significant, however, it can be seen in equation 6 that its coefficient is significant, behind only the feed regulator variable.</p> <p>In the text, the authors comment that Equation 6 presents the regression model for the relationship between tray loss and the independent parameters, however this equation concerns the machine capacity parameter.</p> <p>In the discussion of the Machine Capacity answer, the following statement: <i>"The feed regulator and moisture content with small coefficients had little impact on the rice separation efficiency while the machine speed with negative coefficient means the magnitude was the exact opposite of the rice separation efficiency."</i> is not in agreement with equation 6, related to the same answer.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Improve the presentation and formatting of tables and figures.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In general, the methods did not present enough details for another researcher to reproduce the experiments described.</p> <p>The experimental design and statistical analysis used are adequate for the proposed objective.</p> <p>Regarding the results, the data seems to be well controlled and robust, however, some errors were found in the discussion of the results.</p> <p>The authors presented relevant and current references, however, the discussion and comparison of the results obtained in relation to those in the literature was poor and superficial.</p> <p>As there were mistaken analyses in the discussion of the results, therefore, the conclusions also need to be revised.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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:	<b>Vânia Rosal Guimarães Nascimento</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Federal Rural of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</b>