



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15787
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF OILS OF SHEANUT (<i>Vitellaria paradoxa</i>) AND COCOA (<i>Theobroma cacao</i>)
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	The duration for the sun drying of the samples should be stated. The method used in the extraction of the cocoa butter and shea nut oils was not mentioned under materials and methods and should be described as to whether the process was by mechanical or solvent extraction. It will be very necessary for authors to consider representing the data in tabular form than in the form of graphs. In tabular form the significant differences between the physicochemical properties of the samples can be better indicated using superscripts which in graphical form are not seen. Secondly standard deviation of mean values can also be indicated. In graphical form the small values of properties such as specific gravity, refractive index and unsaponifiable matter are not shown and create the impression that there are zero or not determined. However in tabular form the values can be stated and any significant differences indicated. The same applies to trace amounts of some of the fatty acids in the graph. Under the discussion, besides stating the ranges of the values of the properties, it will be appropriate for comparison of properties of cocoa butter with shea to be clearly stated. This was done for linoleic acid but its lacking in most of the properties determined. Secondly literature values were often quoted for cocoa butter but the same was not done for shea in most cases	The samples were sundried for two weeks after sample collection. The oils were extracted using solvent extraction method. The results are now been shown in tabular form. The necessary corrections have been effected in the manuscript, and for the quoted literature values for cocoa butter, it is expected to be so because much research work (analysis) has been done on cocoa butter than sheanut butter by previous researchers and most importantly, this work is all about comparative study of sheanut with cocoa to determine its suitability for likely replacement where cocoa is widely used.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Spacing between some of the words should be checked.eg under discussion of flash point as well as under data analysis in materials and methods. Under conclusion, the word majorly should be changed to either primarily, mainly, mostly or predominately. Under the list of references, the page numbers for [2] and [15] should be stated. In addition the dates the websites of references [9] and [4] were visited should be included.	Necessary corrections have been made in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Generally the manuscript was clearly and satisfactorily written and technical sound for publication subject to the corrections and suggestions indicated	