



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_50077
Title of the Manuscript:	Extraction of Cellulose Nanocrystals (NCC) from Cotton Waste and Morphology of NCC Obtained with Different Alkali Neutralization
Type of the 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>This manuscript entitled "Extraction of Cellulose Nanocrystals (NCC) from Cotton Waste and Morphology of NCC Obtained with Different Alkali Neutralization", reports interesting data and results, which were obtained by means of simple and well applied methods.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the abovementioned manuscript cannot be published in its present version, and it needs of a major revision according to the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Authors should re-write their manuscript and correct/improve appropriately the English syntax; the present version of this manuscript under consideration is not well followed. (2) Authors forgot to refer and complete the appropriate section with the Materials used in their manuscript; this section should be completed accordingly. (3) The Abstract of the manuscript is almost the same as the Conclusions; therefore, authors should take into take account the distinguished informative role of these two crucial parts of a manuscript <p>Overall: The manuscript is not well written and followed, and it gives the impression of a premature and not ultimate work. Therefore I suggest a major revision of the manuscript before its publication in the journal "Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology"</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel M. Papamichael
Department, University & Country	University of Ioannina, Greece