



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10747
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Solvent Extraction of <i>Parinari polyandra</i> Benth Seed Oil Using Response Surface Methodology
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Abstract and Introduction look fine. • The author is recommended to highlight the novelty of the current study. • How the authors create 32 runs with 4 factor using CCD? CCD with 4 factors/independents variables usually gave 30 (without block) and 31 (with block) treatments/runs. How 32 treatments have been proposed? • Data analysis only for oil recovery/yield? How about other responses which the author mentioned in the methodology ? totally incomplete data analysis, no validation data was reported to justify the optimum point. How the authors found the optimum point? The methodology did not describe the optimization and validation by CCD well. • The second paragraph of section 2.2.6 has been taken from another reference; while the authors are recommended to refer to original reference in this section. • Where is Table including R², p-value of regression and p-value of lack of fit test as well as regression coefficients for all independent variable terms? • The equation is just initial model including both significant and insignificant terms. Why the author did not fit the final reduced	• Thank you • It has been highlighted. The novelty centres on providing new database on the optimization of parinari oil extraction (which is being reported for the first time) towards its utilization potential as feedstock for the industry. • The design expert software 6.0.8 was initially used to create the 40 no of runs. The additional 8 experiments are now included. • Thank you. The objective has been edited to reflect the optimization of the yield. • Validation experiments has been carried out and the data has been included • The optimum point was determined by using the optimization function of the design expert software • Noted , the reference has been cited • The table showing ANOVA for response surface reduced quadratic model and independent variables is now included • The insignificant terms are now removed • The final reduced model has now been re-fitted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	model? The author must rewrite the final reduced models for target response and rewrite the results and discussion again. • There is insufficient discussion to support the observation. • Conclusion is too short; the major achievement of the current study should be indicated. The author is advised to recommend or suggest something for further study.	More discussions are now included the results • The conclusion has been improved upon. • We recommend other modelling • the need to determine the optimal condition to obtain most desirable oil properties suitable for specific industrial uses. We are working on the uses and properties already. •
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend the extensive revision for the current manuscript. The manuscript should be checked with the statistician before re-submission.	We have done extensive revision of this work and carried out additional experiments to validate the model as advised . We hope we have been able to meet up with the journal requirement.