



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read “ effect of Boiling and fermentation on physicochemical properties, fatty acid and micronutrient composition of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> seeds. 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. 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. 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. 5. The abstract should begin with at least one line of introduction. 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. 7. You stated in section 2.1 that samples were all cleaned. How? Give a clear procedure on how the cleaning was done. 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. 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. 10. There should be a method of data analysis before the results and discussion segment. 11. Subject table 2 and 4 to T-test analysis to determine significant differences between treatments. 12. Make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript. 13. Arrange the manuscript according to journal specifications. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Done 2. Done 3. Done 4. Noted and rewritten 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? 6. Done 7. Done 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. 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. 10. Done 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. 12. Done 13. Done <p>Thanks for a quality review</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good work by authors.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	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>