



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_40501
Title of the Manuscript:	Product Qualities of Biodiesel Produced from a Process Intensify Pilot Plant
Type of the Article	Original Research

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>)

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	The manuscript entitles "Product qualities of biodiesel produced from a process intensify pilot plant" focused on the production of biodiesel using various solid catalyst, and analysis of biodiesel properties. Mostly, the manuscript only discussed on the properties analysis, the meanwhile, the process of biodiesel production is revealed in a short discussion. In general, the manuscript is of importance, the analysis is liable and the results are sound. However, there are some lacks of manuscript which should be improved by authors, such as: 1. The abstract is not specific. The authors are asked to rewrite it systematically. 2. The quality of feedstock (Jatropha curcas oil) should be mentioned in the manuscript, for example: FFA content. It is necessary in determination of process selection. 3. Some standards for analysis are not followed by the number, for example: ASTM D???. Please provide the specific number for whole standards applied. 4. The conclusion is too common. It is suggested to rewrite it properly. 5. The reference no. 20 is cited in the body of manuscript. But, it is not founded in the list of reference. Please check and improve it properly.	The abstract is edited for your perusal. The initial free fatty acid of the feed stock is provided now in the text. The standards are put in place for those missing. The standard for pour used was ISO 3016, and it is incited in the text now. The reference 20 is actually 19 and it is corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	N.A.	
Optional/General comments	It is suggested to review manuscript critically to ensure sentences are clear without any grammatical errors.	