

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJACR_95118 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Microcrystalline cellulose of Oil Bean Pod: Extraction, Physico-chemical, BET, and Flow-ability Analysis |
| 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://www.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Title: Would like to suggest title: Microcrystalline cellulose of Oil Bean Pod: Extraction, and Physico-chemical Properties.</p> <p>Abstract The author highlighted the significant results however fail to provide details of the results such as pore diameter, pore volume etc. It is worth to mention the main reason of improvement in many properties of MCC as compared to OBPs. BET should be written down in full then its abbreviations (BET). SEM-ADS?</p> <p>Introduction The introduction is lengthy especially on the BET but fail to discuss method and parameters involved. Paragraph 4 explaining the method of BET which is irrelevant in introduction.</p> <p>Materials and method I would like to recommend the method should be summarize and include in the important steps .Kindly revised the equations as the format/fonts are not in accordance with the format. Specifications/details on Raman is not presented in the methodology in example; The spectra were recorded over a range of 3500e150 cm¹ using an operating spectral resolution of 3 cm¹ and a laser power output of 100 mW.</p> <p>Results and Discussion The MCC, on the other hand, has a lower moisture content of 6.99%, whereas the raw oil bean pod has the highest moisture content of 9.16% Please state the reasons of these findings. Kindly discussed the factors contributed to the different carbon content in OBPs and MCC. The FTIR and Raman spectral should be overlay and presented in the manuscript. Be consistent on SEM EDX/EDS/ADS. It is clearly seen the porosity of the MCC/NCC as compared to the OBPs, the author might as well discussed it and relate with BET results. Lots of unknown abbreviations throughout the manuscript such as BET, SEM-ADS-EDS, PMBP and many more, kindly check it thoroughly.</p> <p>Conclusions Concise conclusions however please check on the spelling errors.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>Grammar errors found throughout the manuscript, kindly proof read or second reader the manuscript for better.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Zuliahani Binti Ahmad |
| Department, University & Country | Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia |