



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_40947
Title of the Manuscript:	Improvement of Delignification, Desilication and Cellulosis Content Availability in Paddy Straw via Physico-Chemical Pre-treatments
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This paper presented very interesting study on Improvement of Delignification, Desilication and Cellulosis Content Availability in Paddy Straw via Physico-Chemical Pre-treatments</p> <p>The reviewer recommends the publication with the following revision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are many irregularities in English in this paper, so it should be revised seriously. 2. Please provide a high resolution quality of figure 1. 3. Discussion part is too weak, this should be revised 4. Conclusions must be comprehensive and not written like a report. 5. It's very important if you added some references of 2016-2017. 	<p>1) All the irregularities has been corrected and improved. Some of the sentences were improved for better understanding; Line 46-49, Line 165-167, Line 169 – 174 and Line 240-245.</p> <p>2) The images in Figure 1 have been improved by scaling up the size for a better view.</p> <p>3) The discussion (3.3 SEM images of cell wall structure of paddy straw) has been added with new point to strengthen our result; added on Line 256 -257 and Line 259 – 261. Since the reviewer did not point out which part that is weak, we try to improve part 3.2, from Line 165 – 180.</p> <p>4) The conclusion has been changed to make them more concise and comprehensive as suggested by the reviewer.</p> <p>5) Few new references were added. We could not find many journal/article related that were published around 2016-2017 to be used as our reference.</p>