



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12548
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical Properties of Rubber (Hevea Brasiliensis) Seed Oil, its Biodiesel and Blends with Diesel
Type of the Article	Research paper

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	Line 1: First word should be "Physicochemical". Line 6: Specify which University. Infact, the entire second sentence should be deleted from the abstract. Line 8: Second last word is not properly written. Line 14: Sentence contains grammatical and punctuation errors. Line 18: Chromatography is normally used for separation and mass spectrometry for identification. How did you do your compound identification? General: The abstract contains some unnecessary methodological details that should be moved to the Methodology section. Line 24: Abbreviations should be defined, that is the reason they are listed. Line 32: How do your results of RSO and B100 compare with those of [3]? Line 34: What is the rationale used to choose only B10 and B20 out of all possible blends? Line 38: The third word is not properly written. Line 51: The sentence is grammatically incorrect. Line 59: Explain how FFA was measured. Line 67: You need a reference for this sentence. Line 85: The sentence is not correctly constructed. Line 110: The sentence is not correctly constructed. Line 209: You don't start a sentence with an abbreviation. Line 235: The section should be discussed in light of chemical composition established, and not in general terms as presented.	Line 1: Corrected Line 6: sentence adjusted Line 8: Corrected Line 14: Grammar checked Line 18: HP ChemStation will indentify and quantified components. General comment noted. Line 24: Abbreviations defined. Line 32: Noted Line 34: B20 gives properties nearest to diesel Lines 38 and 51: Grammar checked. Line 59: Explained Line 67: Reference given Lines 85,110,209: Corrected Line 235: Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 245: The section should be discussed in light of chemical composition established, and not in general terms as presented. Line 262: The second word should be “viscosity” and not “velocity”. Line 268: Replace the word “velocity” with “viscosity”. Line 282: The sentence is not properly constructed. Line 371: Explain why the refractive index increased after blending. Line 447: Some values have no units. Table 2: What is the source of methanol in rubber seed oil? Figure 1: Why is B10 not included in the graph? Figure 4: Axis should have units.	Line 245: Noted Lines 262,268&282: corrected Line 371: Explained Line 447: Units added Fig.1 &4: corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Comments addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is well written and technically acceptable, and deserves publication in the British Journal of Applied Science and Technology. However, the author needs to address/clarify the issues raised above.	Comments appreciated