



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_12889
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination Of Nitrogen And Sulphur Oxides Produced During Combustion Of Jatropha Cake Bio-Pellet
Type of the Article	Short 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Determination of nitrogen and sulphur oxides produced during combustion of Jatropha cake biopellet This article provides useful information. I recommend that it be published after minor changes. Page 1, line 7 The standard wording is "feedstock" not "stock feed". Page 1, line 12 I prefer the word "burned" rather than "burnt". Page 1, line 39, page 2, line 44, page 2, line 86, page 3 line 128, page 3, line 133. The term "calorific value" is an old one that was appropriate when heat was reported in "calories". Heat is now reported in "joules". In my opinion "heating value" (used by the authors on page 2, line 42 is more appropriate. Also see the first line in Table 1. I think the "Materials and methods" section could	Agreed, word changed Agreed, word changed Agreed, word changed The section had been written according to the order of the experiments done. However, re-



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be re-organized. 1. Begin with lines 84-86. Eliminate the last two sentences. In the introduction the authors discuss seeds and shells. At the end of line 86, I think it would be appropriate for the authors to describe the methodology used to obtain the cake studied in this work from the <i>Jatropha curcas</i> plant. 2. Then add lines 88-91, lines 93-95 and line 97 – first sentence only. 3. Then add lines 76-80. 4. Then add lines 107-119. 5. Then add lines 98-103. The first sentence in lines 151 and 152 can be removed, since this was discussed above. Page 3, line 111 Do the authors mean “spectrophotometrically” rather than “calorimetrically”? Page 3, line 116 I am confused. The authors use the word “calorimetrically” but then mention a number that suggests a “photospectrophotometric” technique. After that they describe a “gravimetric” technique. Some clarification is needed. Figure 1 The increase in NO_x with increasing temperature shown is well known to be caused by the change in thermodynamic equilibrium constant	organizing has been accepted, there have been improvement on the presentation of information in this section Agreed, sentence removed There was a typing error, it is supposed to be spectrophotometrically. Word changed The method is spectrophotometric; a UV/Vis was used. The EPA method 375.4 was used Noted
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with increasing temperature. The authors do not offer that as an explanation. Figure 2 The authors should offer some explanation for the decrease in SO₂ at the two largest values of temperature in Figure 2. At those temperatures does sulphur react with some species in the cake to form a solid compound that stays in the solid rather than enter the gas?	Explanation has been offered
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		