



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_45639
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Calorific values of coconut shell and cocoanut husk
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	1. To have the spelling error in the title says a lot about the effort put into manuscript preparation. Please correct them. "Coconut". Correct for the rest of the paper. 2. Abstract can be better and need to be rewritten. See other article how it is written 3. Poor Introduction. Try your best to include what is relevant. Authors can leave out obvious common knowledge that is not relevant. In this paper, authors want to determine the amount of energy inside coconut shell and husk. Focus on urgency on the need for renewable energy, and why coconut husk and shell can be potential material. Focus on this line of thinking. Most people use coconut shell charcoal for energy isn't it? Will unprocessed coconut husk be better than charcoal? You did this experiment to find out isn't it? 4. How is the coconut husk and shell obtained, and how is it processed? Was it powderised and then compressed into a pellet? Was it dried before the experiment? All these are essential information authors need to provide to ensure the experiment can be reproduced. 5. fig 1a,b can be deleted. Everyone knows how coconut looks like. 6. Delete Fig 2. There is no need for a diagram of bomb calorimeter. All you need is to mention the experimental procedures, and the manufacturer of the machine and equipment. 7. Delete fig 3 and 5. (Note. There is no figure 4?) 8. Redo Table 2. If you are doing duplicate. Just average them and show the average with the standard deviation. There is no need for mentioning initial mass, mass of water. This information should be in the methodology. 9. Delete Line 163-179. There is no need to show the mathematical working. 10. Redo table 3 as following the feedback for table 2. 11. Delete line 197-212 12. When you obtained the average calorie value. You should compare to other resources reported in the literature.	1. The spelling error in the title has been corrected and elsewhere too. 2. Abstract has been rewritten. 3. The introduction has been rewritten. 4. The samples were air-dried and no further treatment were done and broken into micrometer pieces. 5. Authors are of the view that not everyone knows how a heap of coconut husks and shells look like. Even in Ghana where the work was done, it is only the southern part of the country that these heaps are prevalent. But the figure 1 has been deleted. 6. Authors decided to show the bomb calorimeter because this was locally fabricated. We are aware there are several modern types which were not available to us. Because of this, it was important to show what we used. 7. Figures 3 and 5 have been removed. 8. Table 2 has been redone. 9. Lines 163-179 have been deleted. 10. Table 3 has been redone. 11. Lines 197-212 have been removed. 12. The comparison has been done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		