



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12940
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of the Chemical Properties of some Selected Refined Vegetable Oils Commonly sold in Nigeria.
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	- Abstract: you should indicate what kind of vegetable oil is, from what seeds it comes from. If you do not know this data, you should indicate that they are "unknown pure or mixed vegetal oils". 1. Introduction: you should include in text the theoretical lipid profile (fatty acids %) of the vegetable oil that will be tested, although this information is in the reference cited, it would be useful in order to clarify the content and aim of the manuscript, therefore you could compare the obtained experimental results with the predicted theoretical results to in this way detect falsifications, frauds, scams and so on. 2. Material an methods: It would be convenient to extend the content of this section, for example explaining better in a briefly way all applied procedures, as well as the origin and brands of materials. - References: 2, 3, 21. Link currently does not work properly.	The kinds of vegetable oils used in the study and the seeds they come from have been indicated. Thanks. The theoretical lipid profile of the vegetable oils that were tested have been included. Thanks. All the applied procedures used in the characterization of the oils have been briefly explained as required. Thanks There were some minor error in the links



SDI Review Form 1.6

	14. I think it is not a scientifically adequate or reliable reference. 22. The link does not appear. 25. If you have used this material it is more adequate to indicate in method and materials section, if not, I think it is not a scientifically adequate or reliable reference, because of its commercial and marketing interests.	(2, 3, 21) and they have been corrected. However , if you find it difficult opening the links you may have to go through google, type the title of the work or article as well as the name (s) of the authors. However link 21 is now reference 9 as a result of reviewer's correction. Thanks. Link 14 has been removed. Thanks. The link for reference 22 has been provided reference 22 is now 24 due to additional references. Thanks. Link 25 have been removed .Thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	3. Results and discussion: You can show better the obtained results, already collected in tables, completing them with a corresponding histograms bars figure of each table. Indicating there also the maximum and/or minimum limits of the checked parameter. 4. In conclusion section (L 270) according to the acid value of the oil you can estimate organoleptic properties; the term "poisonous" is a bit disproportionate.	The histogram has been provided. Thanks The correction has been effected in the text. Thanks.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the manuscript does not appear as Novelty, it seems to be scientifically and technically correct.	