



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Check through the language. Proofreading is necessary. 2. Contradiction in equilibrium time assumed in extraction experiment, 5 or 6 hours? Check line 88 and 117. 3. Data presentation in Figure 4 and Figure 5 are not clear. 4. The data provided at introduction is not as cited ie explanation in line 17 is different from what mentioned in reference. 5. Some reference is not relevant with citation (ie, reference no 2 does not mention anything related to economic value of coal tar components) 6. Please justify the use of kerosene as artificial coal tar 7. Please justify the difference of v/v of phenol, o-cresol, p-cresol in the artificial coal tar (why difference) Line 14, 25, 26 exactly similar to http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/ie402599d; line 32,33,34 is almost similar to https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jpi/48/1/48_1_60/_pdf Line 144-146; http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1021/ie402599d	1. I have a proofreading of my manuscript with profesional proofreader. 2. The true time of equilibrium in extraction experiment is 5 hours. 3. Figure 4 and figure 5 are replaced. 4. The data are corrected. 5. Ref no.2 does not mention an economic value of coal tar, but it citate all of the statements in the line 28-31. 6. Kerosene is almost similary with the coal tar . It contains such as C,H,O. Phenol, o-Cresol, and p-Cresol are completely miscible with kerosene. (Line 107-109) 7. Model coal tar in this research is similary with the real coal tar which is obtained by coal pyrolysis. Using a method of GC-MS, the analysis shows that coal tar contains more than 53 components. The total phenolic compounds contained in coal tar is 39.44% (v/v). Of those, the largest are phenol (8.06% v/v), o-cresol (3.45% v/v), and p-cresol (11.06% v/v). Line 14, 25, 26 and line 32,33,34 are revised. https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jpi/48/1/48_1_60/_pdf is not found.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. GC operation conditions, quality control measures and retention time of analyses should be reported.	1. GC operation are added in the manuscript (line 101-103).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. In reality, it is rare to have no material loss during extraction. Check line 112. 2. Much information from this manuscript need to be recheck 3. Recommendation for Turnitin to check the manuscript for unoriginal content.	All of the comments (1-3) are done and revised.