



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1680
Title of the Manuscript:	Fuel and Physiochemical properties of Cashew (<i>Anacardium Occidentale</i>) Nut oil, its Methyl Esters and Blends.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Poor presentation and plenty of mistakes	Presentation improved
Specific comments:	- Line no 56-66, the process of oil extraction must be generalised. - In conclusions part how rubber seed oil methyl ester [line no: 267] appears! Instead of CSOME. - Fig 1 repeated twice –line no 24 & 250/39 and 396.	Errors noted and corrected
Title and abstract	Simple corrections required	Done
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Well defined but plenty of mistakes	Mistakes corrected
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Relevant	Thanks
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	The process of oil extraction must be generalised.	Done
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	The oil content was 40.4% which means that about 266 640 tonnes of biodiesel can be produced from cashew nut oil annually if all the nuts are used for the purpose. Reference and related backgrounds are required for above statement.	That aspect of the paper has been removed.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	Good experimentation	Thanks
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Not supported by the data:- Example-Rubber seed oil methyl ester [line no: 267] appears instead of CSOME. Few more conclusion points required based on the investigation.	Corrected
References	Enough references	Thanks