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	It is described an effect of different drying methods on mineral composition of three accessions of roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) calyces. The interesting results were obtained. The experimental and result parts are described clear, illustrative and comprehensive but with serious objective flaws as - lack of basic description the method of Ca, Mg, Na, K, P, Zn, Fe elements analyses; - basic information is lacking of explanation an influence of different drying methods on mineral composition of three accessions of roselle calyces. Further, statistical data presentation in Tables 3.1.1 – 3.1.7 is unclear. Why did not use the authors rather in Tables columns the confidence intervals? It is recommended a more detailed description and symbols characterisation used in Tables 3.1.1 – 3.1.7. For more details see yellowed notices directly in manuscript.	We have done the modification as per the reviewer's comments The explanation has been improved accordingly
Minor REVISION comments	Small discrepancies of formally character appeared – for more details see yellowed notices directly in manuscript.	Corrected as suggested
Optional/General comments	Classical and simple done paper but with objective discrepancies. I do not support the manuscript for publication without revision.	Modification done as suggested by you and effected in the revised manuscript