



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_46881
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MICROCRYSTALLINE CELLULOSE ISOLATED FROM THE POD HUSK AND STALK OF FLUTED PUMPKIN
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	While I appreciate the care with which it was carried out, I have several limitations. Reference and writing may be improved. Based on downstream-based total mass balance (by practical applications; e.g., cellulolytic cascades/mechanisms) as compared to previous ones, their case studies may be reconsidered and discussed. The quality of scientific meaning may be general.	I don't understand some part of the reviewer's comment [i.e . Based on downstream-based total mass balance (by practical applications; e.g., cellulolytic cascades/mechanisms) as compared to previous ones, their case studies may be reconsidered and discussed] However, this article is aimed at isolating microcrystalline cellulose from two novel sources obtained from the same plant and comparing their physicochemical properties as well as determining their compositions

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues