

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_93891
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULUS OF ELASTICITY, MODULUS OF RUPTURE AND COMPRESSION STRENGTH OF TWO THERMALLY TREATED GHANAIAN LESSER-USED WOOD SPECIES
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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

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. Recommended title: Evaluating the effect of thermal treatment on some mechanical properties of two lesser used wood species grown in Ghana. 2. A map showing location of either virgin or plantation where the logs were obtained. The climatic and weather conditions of the sites are required, plantations age and other environmental factors should be mentioned. 3. It appears only 1 log each of the species was studied, the merchantable length not stated, the author collected samples 5m above Dbh, what percentage of the merchantable length is the 5m from Dbh and what were the other levels collected: eg 10%,20%,30%,etc. It is needful to establish the variation of the mechanical wood properties along the bole. 4. It is not clear how the author collected samples from the heartwood, were they from the pith outwards to the bark and what were the reasons for sampling the heartwood. The mechanical wood properties studied and results from the heartwood will be of immense benefit to other researchers. 5. Technical standards used were adequate. However data obtained were not quite robust, no references during discussion to support author's position. 6. Experimental design outlay is not understood. Statistical package used should be stated to justify the ANOVA. How he came up with 30 replicates should be clearer. 7. 1 tree per species in a plantation is not adequate for the analysis of variance. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This work will ,if scientifically done will add to knowledge, hence requires major revisions	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	U. I. Udoakpan
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria