



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=sd-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	<p>The cellulosic waste streams which the author mentioned in lines 25-27 should be updated with recent references at least from 2015 -2019.</p> <p>In line 29, the author mentioned PVA which is a polymer and not a biopolymer as stated.</p> <p>Recasting of line 43 where the author is trying to state the aim of the study.</p> <p>Lines 55-56 The author stated that "Crystalline nanocellulose (NCC) has been extracted starting from a solution of 70% long bleached fiber from cotton mass and 30% short fiber from cotton linter". The underlined statement is not the reagent you prepared. Which solution are you referring to?</p> <p>In line 62, the acronym DLS must be explained in full when writing it for the first time before using in it in that form for subsequent write-ups.</p> <p>The explanation of DLS in lines 76-86 is not required under materials and method. The author needs to state what he/she did without explaining in detail the principle of DLS.</p> <p>The caption of fig 7 should be Micrograph of cellulose extracted using NH₃ neutralization.</p> <p>line 196 statement "This result could be exploited when disposing protocol for the possible introduction of NCC for the repair of historical paper artifacts" is not clear.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>General editorial work</p> <p>Improve in the technical writing to convey understanding</p>	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Umeileka Chisom C</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria</i>