SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 (*Anarcardium Occidentale*) 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:	**Only results are given with a minimum of interpretation/discussion. Unless this journal is happy with the fact that the obtained results show that the methyl ester modified bio-oil is suitable as diesel fuel.**	
Specific comments:	Abstracts and introduction are OK, as material and methods. But results and discussion chapter is rather limited to the results and an extended repetition of what is shown in table 3. Conclusion and recommendation are even less.	
Title and abstract	OK	
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	OK	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	OK	
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)*	See above general comment. Line 57: I do not see the relevancy of part:"in the compound" Line 58: delete part "in the month" Line 60-61: place a comma after "average" ; part "and expose more area" is not understandable Line 62: grader => grade Line 65: operated => operating Line 72: 23.68 mg KOH/g (NOT gm) (idem lines 212,213); oleic, ??? Line 80: rev/min => rpm? Temp => temperature Line 111: metal with small letter "m" Line 114: mg => Mg Lines 116,118: content with small letter "c", as distillation with small letter "d"	
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?)	Line number 4 at line 131: linoleic => oleic and 34.47% should be 28.87% palmitic ... At different places and in each subchapter: CNO => CSO!!!! CNOME => CSOME but in the table B100 is used, so use only one symbol!!! Even other notation are used! Line 142: add: <u>a little bit</u> above zero Sorry, totally insufficient, no real discussion	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	Using a food product for bio-oil production is not acceptable (personal	

	opinion), one should use agricultural waste !!!!!!!!!!!!	
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)	The formulate conclusion are no conclusions, nor recommendations. Totally new data are presented, we have to guess where they are coming from.	
References	OK	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer