



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_9869
Title of the Manuscript:	Separation of Palmitic and Palmitoleic Acid and their FAMES using Transition Metal Salts
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	The overall presentation of the manuscript lacks scientific detail. There are some poor phrasing of sentences e.g. Line 41, 59, 77, 79 (word scalable does not make sense here), 93,115, 119 (time of stirring does not make technical sense), 141 There are minor typographical errors. Lines 35,51,69,110, 124,125,126 (spelling error and poor layout of equations), 136, 157, 160 (degree celcius sign) ,173, 181 (define symbol alpha) Some claims highlighted in the introduction have no valid referencing e.g. Lines 29 ,30 ; 33,34,35; Design Expert (no definition of this programme). No clear information has been highlighted e.g. line 131 – salts need to defined as hydrates or not. The photos are labelled as figures and the captions are too long e.g. figs.1 and 2. The results and discussions are extremely sketchy and are not logically explained. The large error bars are not accounted for in Figure 3. The caption of figure 3 is too long and does not make scientific sense. The axes of figure 3 needs attention. The caption in figure 3 is an explanantion by the author: “we can clearly see a trend....” The illogical explanation of the results is clearly evident in lines 221 and 222 when the author write:” the FAMEs not staying in the aqueous layer” is highly non-scientific. Lines 229, 230,231 are nonsensical discussions:”While the difference in case of blank solution is negligible...”	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The author also discusses “kinks” and “bends” in the structure of the fatty acids which makes absolutely no sense from a bonding mechanism point of view. The author needs to clearly explain the type of bonding or complexation that facilitates the precipitation between metal ions and fatty acids. The overall content is extremely weak. The discussions are non-scientific and highly flawed. The conclusions are inconclusive and no-sensical for example the author concludes “in separating a singular ester from a mixture...”	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion the paper required extreme major revision in both results, discussion and conclusion sections. This paper cannot be published in this format even with suggested corrections and rephrasing.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer