SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	**2013_IRJPAC_3927**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Determination Of Optimum Reaction Temperature And Reaction Time For Biodiesel Yield From Coconut (Cocos nucifera) Oil.**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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. **The work presented is a very preliminary work.** 2. **Base for the selection of parameters other than time and temperature is not made clear.** 3. **Since the acid value and FFA contents are not falling under standard limits, Biodiesel confirmation tests need to be carried out using analytical techniques like HPLC or GC-MS.** 4. **There are publications wherein scientists have tried with high FFA content feedstock and got high yield, as mentioned in paper also "two stage process".** 5. **Methanol balance is very much important when you are dealing with reaction temperature 60 degC or above. It is not shown in paper.** 6. **The trend shown in the Fig 1 indicates that biodiesel volume increases constantly after 55 degC . Hence, one should study further above 65 degC using good reflux condition. Also, the possible reason for such behaviour of the reaction is not explained in the discussion part.** 7. **The reason for constant decrease in the biodiesel volume production after 45 minutes of reaction time is not discussed in depth.**	

	8. **As shown in Fig 2, the biodiesel volume at 30 minutes is almost equal to the 45 minutes result. Then why 45 minutes are considered as optimum time?** 9. **Fig 1 and Fig 2 are not discussed under the results and discussion. It needs to be.** 10. **Composition analysis of feedstock is not carried out by the authors. They have accepted the published composition.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dr Amishkumar Vyas**
Department, University & Country	**Chemical Engineering, Nirma University, India**