



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_48658
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF BOILING AND FERMENTATION ON PHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES, FATTY ACID AND MICRONUTRIENTS COMPOSITION OF Hibiscus sabdariffa SEEDS
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/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The topic should read “ effect of Boiling and fermentation on physicochemical properties, fatty acid and micronutrient composition of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> seeds.</li> <li>2. The common name of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> should be included after the scientific name in the topic and in the first line of the introduction.</li> <li>3. The study design in the abstract is written wrongly. The study design should be in completely randomised design, completely randomised block design or factorial expression.</li> <li>4. The conclusion in the abstract does not make sense. The conclusion should be based on the findings of the work and should be more precise. Please, rewrite section.</li> <li>5. The abstract should begin with at least one line of introduction.</li> <li>6. The introduction did not clearly state the objective of the study. Please clearly state the objective of the research in the last paragraph of the introduction.</li> <li>7. You stated in section 2.1 that samples were all cleaned. How? Give a clear procedure on how the cleaning was done.</li> <li>8. You need to explain in clear details how you determined each physicochemical parameter in section 2.3. What you have written is just a summary.</li> <li>9. You need to explain in detail (step by step) procedure how the minerals and vitamins mentioned in the manuscript were determined. What you have written is summary.</li> <li>10. There should be a method of data analysis before the results and discussion segment.</li> <li>11. Subject table 2 and 4 to T-test analysis to determine significant differences between treatments.</li> <li>12. Make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript.</li> <li>13. Arrange the manuscript according to journal specifications.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Done</li> <li>2. Done</li> <li>3. Done</li> <li>4. Noted and rewritten</li> <li>5. The format/headings of the abstract specified for the journal did not include introduction. The first line is titled “Aim”. Should it be added to the Aim?</li> <li>6. Done</li> <li>7. Done</li> <li>8. The detailed procedures for determining each of the physicochemical properties (9 of them) are too long and will consume a significant amount of the article volume. We (the authors) decided to state the methods and the references where the detailed procedures can be obtained.</li> <li>9. The detailed procedures for determining each of the minerals and vitamins are too long and will consume a significant amount of the article volume. We (the authors) decided to state the methods and the references where the detailed procedures can be obtained.</li> <li>10. Done</li> <li>11. Okay. Table 4 has been subjected to statistical analysis and the results have been included in the appropriate section. The outcome of the result in table 2 did not allow for such determinations.</li> <li>12. Done</li> <li>13. Done</li> </ol> <p>Thanks for a quality review</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good work by authors.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>