



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_43704
Title of the Manuscript:	REVIEW OF DIFFERENT PURIFICATION TECHNIQUES FOR CRUDE GLYCEROL FROM BIODIESEL PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	<p>Line 23; The authors should put the year of the reference</p> <p>Line 25, has should be changed to have</p> <p>Line 40; target should be changed to targetted</p> <p>Apart from the low level of the English writing, the paper lacks the basic components of a review paper. The authors are advised to read major review papers for thorough understanding of how to write review papers.</p> <p>Twelve papers were cited herein which does not qualify a paper for mini review, nonetheless a major review paper. Over hundred referenced papers used in a review may some cases not be enough to capture the detailed literature report about the subjects.</p> <p>It is clear that the authors have not done extensive literature search expected of a review paper</p>	<p>Thank you for the review. All the grammatical errors noticed have been corrected. Also, more reference papers have been added but I disagree on the number of references that I have to cite. This research area is still emerging i.e. cost-effective way to refine the glycerol.</p> <p>Thank you once again.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>A review paper presents further research areas for readers to embark upon. Each subtopic reviewed should provide a research opening for researchers to key in. Such and related are not contained in this paper.</p>	<p>Yes, the reviewer is correct to an extent. As said in the paper, the purity of the refined glycerol is dependent on the end use. Pharma-grade or food grade level of refining clearly is still on-going research.</p>
Optional/General comments		