

PART 1:

Journal Name:	BritishJournalofAppliedScience&Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24551
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and Analysis of Pyrolysis Oil (Bio-Oil) From Mahogany Wood
New Title:	Production by Pyrolysis and Analysis of Bio-oil from Mahogany Wood (<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>)
Type of Article:	Original research papers

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>The quality of the article greatly improved after the new intervention of the authors. Will contribute enough to the scientific community.</p> <p>The article could have been stronger if it were exploited the discussion in relation to bio-oil. It seems that the main intention of the authors was to show the construction of a pyrolytic reactor. I did not see any justification for the choice of mahogany in this work (plant relatively noble and used for other purposes).</p> <p>REVISION COMMENTS</p> <p>NOTE: Changes made in this second review (little adjustments) it was marked in blue, in the text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The botanical classification of mahogany was included in the text. Consult the authors what kind of plant that was used in the experiments (see attachments). Some examples: <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>, <i>Swietenia mahagoni</i>, <i>Swietenia humilis</i> etc. The Figures 1 and 2 were replaced to accelerate the publication of the article. I made the changes suggested in the first review. Request approval of the authors. There was exclusion of parts of the original article submitted. Item 2.2 of the condenser does not compromise the understanding, but the items of analysis 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 (experimental procedures of elemental analysis and infrared) will lack for readers who may be interested in repeating the experiment. The discussion in section 3.1 could have been explored. It is very poor. They could have done some confrontations with other work on bio-oils of sources similar or different to show the viability of the reactor and of the product. The recommendation for the section 3.3 of discussion was omitted. It is unfortunate, missing scientific enthusiasm. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Francisco Sávio Gomes Pereira</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology, Pernambuco-IFPE, Campus Recife, Brazil</i>