SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_22101**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT STORAGE CONDITIONS ON RAPESEED OILS QUALITY**
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	**In my opinion, there are major drawbacks in this paper. The needs of studying frozen oil should be clear, as there is no obvious advantage to store it in this form. However, more interesting is the comparison between 4 and 20 celsius degrees. Moreover, the materials and methods applied should be better defined, i.e. the type and volume of containers. It would be interesting not just to measure the composition of the oils at the end of the storage period (the date is not clear), but also during the storage itself.** **The results should be presented in a more clear way, and a deeper discussion is needed. I feel that the authors need a deeper review of the relevant literature, to better introduce the topic, and to compare their results with previous findings.** **It is, however, interesting that many different types of oils from the market were tested. I'd suggest to include more information about them, where possible (for example, location, producer, shelf-life period, etc. indicated on the label).** **For these reasons, I would suggest the paper to be rejected in this form. It might be re-submitted after careful corrections, and possibly after repeating some measurements during the storage, if the editor agrees.**	We made the following corrections: • Added part in the introduction with relevant literature • Added type and volume of containers in table with materials • Added ANOVA analysis in Table 2 and 3 • Changed CV on SD • Added one part in discussion about fatty acid composition • Added time of storage and number of samples under the tables • Rephrased sentences that were not clear enough. We also verified in the literature parts that were questionable.

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Please find minor revision comments directly added as comment in the pdf file attached.	We made corrections and added it to the text.
Optional/General comments	Please see my comments in the pdf file.	