



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	An overall remark is to be given about the English language used in the manuscript, it certainly needs serious editing. The introduction is very poor regarding the scientific knowledge of the background and the quality of the references which is very low. The information is given without any synthesis. To elaborate a good synthesis Authors should have considered basic scientific papers from the Food science and Process fields and not in majority from medical papers. Line 78-79: the duration of the total operation is equal to the duration of one step of the operation! Line 88: the advantage of the central composite design mentioned in the experimental design is that each parameter has 5 levels, yet in the table 2 results show that time and temperature has only 3 levels and solid solvent ratio 4. The experimental design presented by the authors is completely unclear and in all cases it is absolutely not a central composite design. In figure 2: the error bars present very high uncertainty and in this case it does not obvious to confirm any significant effect (the curve could become easily "parallel"). In the caption of figure 3 it is not clear if the experiment was realized in presence of n-hexane or ether. There is a significant lack of the discussion of the results.	• Thank you, the write –up has now been edited and we hope it will meet the outlined requirements • The introduction has been improved on • More references are now added • This is a new research interest in industrial field and there is general lack of information on the feedstock both as process feedstock and food. • The procedure and duration is now well-spelt out • The design expert generated the table using CCD. The number of runs initially generated was 40 . However, the 8 experiments are now carried out and included. • Fig 2 shows the interaction between time and oil yield • Fig 3caption has been corrected to indicate hexane as the solvent • More discussion is now included for the results
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		