



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_45087
Title of the Manuscript:	Extraction and characterization of bast Fibres from Roselle (Hibiscus Sabdariffa) stem for industrial application
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	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract should be organized into the following sections: background, methods, results, and conclusion - Background: study context + a clearly-stated aim (context could be drawn from lines 61-68 of the “introduction”) - Methods: excerpt of key executed tasks that yield what authors consider as ‘significant findings’ in their work. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To state the aim at the end of background information <p>MATERIAL & METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lines 72, 84, 93, 107, & 184: to check for typographic and grammatical errors <p>RESULTS & DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section leaves much to be desired in terms of discussion. For the observed outcomes, what are the plausible explanations? What is the general trend with respect to similar earlier studies? What could be accountable for differences or similarities (in case of any)? <p>REFERENCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authors should consult an appropriate referencing guide to harmonize the reference list; references are done variously without adhering to any specific style. Examples are drawn from ref. (line 209-211) & ref. (line 212-214) which do not follow the same style. Authors should as well focus on the rules of writing authors’ names, as irregularities are observed in the list. 	Thank you very much Your observation was helpful.
Minor REVISION comments	Text should be revised for minor language issues.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	I agree with reviewer