

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_129441
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLAR COOKER, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND PERFORMANCE.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript titled " Solar Cooker: Design, Construction, and Performance " presents a technically sound and innovative approach to replacing traditional firewood as a cooking fuel, particularly in rural areas. The authors propose a sustainable, cost-effective, and environmentally friendly solution using locally available materials. This practical approach makes the design highly feasible and relevant for broader implementation in regions with similar resource availability. The solar cooker achieves an impressive efficiency of 89% under adequate sunlight, demonstrating its potential as an alternative cooking method. It can heat water to a maximum temperature of 89 °C, sufficient for preparing light food items and boiling tea, highlighting its utility for everyday cooking needs.	THANKS
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Performance Evaluation of Fabricated Solar Cooker	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is conceptually ok.	THANKS
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The authors measured the boiling temperatures for water and milk over several days and reported an efficiency of 90%, but they did not provide any mathematical formula to support their evaluation. It is essential to include the fundamental principles and equations used for assessing the performance of the fabricated solar cooker, even though they referenced the concept of black body radiation. While the technical work is commendable, the presentation lacks the structure and clarity expected in a research paper, resembling more of a report or thesis.	IMPROVED
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	For a efficiency approach the author may add this reference (https://iaeme.com/Home/article_id/IJMET_07_06_017) (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4573025).	DONE
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to check grammar and flow of manuscript. This content is like a report with basic theory not a article.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript " <i>Solar Cooker: Design, Construction, and Performance</i> " offers a technically innovative approach to replacing traditional firewood as a cooking fuel, particularly in rural areas. By utilizing locally available materials, the authors propose a sustainable and cost-effective solution that is both practical and environmentally friendly, with significant potential for widespread adoption in regions with similar resources. However, the manuscript requires considerable improvement in terms of presentation and writing quality. It gives the impression of being directly extracted from a thesis without proper adaptation for journal publication. The objectives, hypothesis, literature review, and theoretical framework are all merged within the introduction, lacking standalone sections. Moreover, the reference format needs revision, and references should be seamlessly integrated into the text without altering paragraph or sentence structure unnecessarily.	Thanks. IMPROVED

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	NIL