



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16693
Title of the Manuscript:	Complex Extraction of Phenol,o-Cresol, and p-Cresol from Model Coal Tar with Methanol and Acetone Solutions
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	Data on the variation of interfacial tension and viscosity for the model coal tar with temperature would benefit readers. A McCabe –Thiele graphical construction would have been useful to show the number of stages needed to effect the separation. Methodology is poorly written. Seems to me 2.1.3. is the methodology. Fig 1 is not clear since the key mentions black and white. Fig 4 is cluttered – the x-axis is confusing. The conclusion needs to be rewritten – it is winding and unclear.	A McCabe –Thiele graphical construction didn't use for this research because the authors don't calculated the number of stages for this process. It will be use for the next research for the real coal tar. 2.1.3. is replace to the methodology. Fig 1 is replaced by with the key mentions red and blue. Fig 4 is replaced. The conclusion is rewritten.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		