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 (Vitellaria paradoxa) AND COCOA (Theobroma cacao)**
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	**I thank indication to revise Article COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE physicochemical PROPERTIESOF OILS OF sheanut (Vitellaria paradoxa) AND COCOA (Theobroma cacao), however I have some questions:** **- What is the relevance of investigating the physicochemical PROPERTIESOF OILS OF sheanut (Vitellaria paradoxa) AND COCOA (Theobroma cacao)?** **- One of the main items of work is the analysis of fatty acids, however this was not used for internal standardization? How does this affect the results presented? Are they reliable?**	
Minor REVISION comments	not applicable	
Optional/General comments	The work has no innovation, and serious errors of analysis of fatty acids.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Brazil**