Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_48965**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of different drying methods (oven, sun and solar) on the mineral content of three accessions of roselle (Hibiscus sabdariffa) calyces**
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)

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	**The following study focused on drying methods e.g. oven, sun, and solar. Nevertheless, the materials provided by authors are not enough to justify the results.** **Why authors used these three methods of drying? How would authors differentiate the sun and solar drying? Details of solar dryer? What was the initial moisture content of material?** **Authors measured the minerals content but which methods were used to measure? Provide specific protocols with references.** **I suggest revising the manuscript extensively especially materials and methods section.** **Strictly follow the journal guidelines, the headings of all sections need to be checked.** **Line 44. Numbered 2.0 material and method** **Line 112 numbered 2.0 results** **Be consistent with the same level of headings e.g. line 45, 2.1 capital letters and line 73, 2.3 lowercase letters. Similarly check other headings.** **In figures 1, 2, and 3 total drying duration is 5 hours, in comparison of sun, solar and oven drying methods. Is it possible to reduce moisture content from more than 80 to nearly 10 % in all methods? Need justification.** **Provide uncertainty in a reported measurements in all figures as well as in tables?** **Conclusions of the research are not enough. What is the significant finding of the research?** **Need English editing.**	Authors done the revision and effected in the revised manuscript Done All subsection has been numbered and revised accordingly Conclusion has been restructured and revised accordingly English has been edited
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		