



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract includes all measurements results, which is a bit inappropriate, since they appear in the main text already. You would need to point out the main results, as far as the superiority of pros and cons of the two different methods, in no more than 150 words possibly, to be crisp and effective. 2. Another point is that the effect of retting especially as far as fibre morphology is concerned needs to be illustrated by comparative images of the retted fibres obtained with the two methods. Yet, there is no image (a macrograph 10x or so would fit the purpose, if you are able to show sections of different fibres it would be even better. 3. A number of studies on comparison between bacterial and chemical retting of other plant fibres are available. However, you don't compare with any of these. Basically there is no discussion in your paper after results, please add a discussion section at least of 10-15 lines or so. 	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The correction has been done with the macrograph image</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper investigates the properties of roselle fibres extracted by two different methods, namely bacterial retting and chemical retting procedures. The paper is innovative in this sense, although there are limitations as far as the study is concerned, as shown above. I would not be against publication, provided the above requirements are fulfilled.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>I agree with reviewer</p>