



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_48965
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different drying methods (oven, sun and solar) on the mineral content of three accessions of roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>) calyces
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-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>It is described an effect of different drying methods on mineral composition of three accessions of roselle (<i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i>) calyces. The interesting results were obtained. The experimental and result parts are described clear, illustrative and comprehensive but with serious objective flaws as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of basic description the method of Ca, Mg, Na, K, P, Zn, Fe elements analyses; - basic information is lacking of explanation an influence of different drying methods on mineral composition of three accessions of roselle calyces. <p>Further, statistical data presentation in Tables 3.1.1 – 3.1.7 is unclear. Why did not use the authors rather in Tables columns the confidence intervals? It is recommended a more detailed description and symbols characterisation used in Tables 3.1.1 – 3.1.7. For more details see yellowed notices directly in manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Small discrepancies of formally character appeared – for more details see yellowed notices directly in manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Classical and simple done paper but with objective discrepancies. I do not support the manuscript for publication without revision.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miloslav Milichovsky
Department, University & Country	University of Pardubice, Europe