Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_94271**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF STRENGTH PROPERTIES OF WHITE MANGROVES (Laguncularia racemosa) FROM THE CENTRAL AND WESTERN REGIONS OF GHANA**
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	1. This claim: "In general, Laguncularia racemosa exhibits somewhat superior mechanical qualities" is inconsistent with the paragraphs of the conclusions in the manuscript. 2. the phrase "Compression Strength" is not quite right, it is more common to use the phrase "compressive strength". 3. Key points in the script are difficult to understand. If a lot refers to the numbers from the test results, it is better to present them in tabular form so that they are easy to understand and compared. 4. The units of measurement are inconsistent in some parts. Example: MOR in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 uses the Nmm-2 unit, but in categorization based on citation [17] the unit is MPa. It is better to state in detail at the beginning what units are used for each mechanical property being tested. 5. The conclusion is not in accordance with the objectives stated at the beginning of the manuscript. Please explain the relationship between the results of testing the mechanical properties of wood with the efficiency of use and "In order to maximize the use of mangroves as a construction material" as stated at the beginning of the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The abbreviation of the term Compressive Strength Parallel to the Grain to CPG is not common, because Compressive Strength Perpendicular to Grain also forms the abbreviation CPG. 2. It is better to describe what mechanical properties are tested in the study at the beginning, especially at the beginning of the methods section. 3. The vertical axis in each figure represents the mean of each mechanical property measured, so it is better written as "Mean of ..." 4. The explanation for the symbols in each Table is unclear. Please provide an explanation for each code/symbol in the table, such as SS, DF, MS, F(DFn, DFd), and P value symbols.	
Optional/General comments	1. The test standard is the British Standard Methods of Testing Small Clear Specimens of Lumber, which have been checked and declared appropriate. 2. Three mature L. racemosa trees seem insufficient to represent the woods of the Western and Central regions. It is better to include these limitations in the Abstract section. 3. Manuscripts would be better off if they included photos of test documentation for each mechanical property tested as well as pictures of the wood samples tested.	

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)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Achmad Fahrurozi**
Department, University & Country	**Gunadarma University, Indonesia**