

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_116875</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bio-chemical preparation of microcrystalline cellulose powder from cotton linters for utilization as tablet excipients</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript offers valuable insights</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract comprehensive however may need to work on some editorial issues</p> <p>The subsections and the structure appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript rigorously adheres to the scientific method, presenting empirical evidence and logical reasoning to support its conclusions. All cited references are pertinent and sufficient; nevertheless, substitute older sources with more contemporary ones.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the language is okay. However some of the statements may need to be rephrased.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is clear, coherent, and effectively communicated</li> <li>2. The research methodology and analysis are thorough and robust. However the methods on physico-chemical properties should be more elaborate.</li> <li>3. The author may need to explain whether some of the methods related to crystallinity were validated.</li> <li>4. The results logically presented. Some gaps are identified related to the tables and the captions. See some of the highlighted comments in the document. Ensure every detail of the methods carried out are presented in a clear manner</li> <li>5. Discussion and conclusions are reliable and well-supported based on the evidence presented.</li> <li>6. All the references cited relevant and adequate, however replace older sources with more current ones.</li> <li>7. Work of some editorials as suggested in the document.</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Margaret W. Kariuki</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kirinyaga University, Kenya</b>