SCIENCEDOMAIN international



www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 PRRI 2609
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodiesel Production from Tigernut (<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>) Oil and Characterization of its Blend with Petro-diesel

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 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



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 author may want to revise the third sentence of	
	the abstract to remove the repetition of catalyst.	
	2. The third to the last sentence starting with 'their' should be revised to state what the 'their' is.	
	3. Ensure that petrol diesel or petrol-diesel use should be the same throughout the paper.	
	4. The last sentence in the abstract: 'Therefore, the	
	blends will be suited to engines not specifically	
	designed for biodiesel use', should be revised to	
	correct the notion that the blends tested are suited	
	basically for engines not specifically designed for	
	biodiesel use. I suppose the blends will equally be	
	suited for engines designed for D100 and the petro-	
	diesel and biodiesel blends	
	5. Lines 23/24, the words global risk is vague. The risk	
	intended should be clearly specified, if the starting	
	statement in the introduction is not the authors' the	
	reference should be specified.	
	6. Line 24, change had to has.	
	7. Line 34, change '3live stock food' to livestock feed.	
	8. Line 24, Florida mentioned in the list, is it a country of	r
	just a State in US, if the latter, it should be state as	
	Florida, US.	
	9. Ensure a clear paragraphing of the text, as required by	



SCIENCEDOMAIN

www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6	SCHENGEL	Onnen :
	the Journal.	
	10. Line 40, 'have exploited', will have explored be better if you meant investigated?	
	11. Line 41, change 'soy bean' to soybean.	
	12. Line 42, you may want to change the first sentence to:	
	'however, the availability of these raw materials varies from country to country.	
	13. Line 44, is, 'it is not a staple food', suffice or adding	
	the widely consumed is necessary? In which case,	
	state the reference place, where is not widely	
	consumed.	
	14. Line 45, change crop to crops.	
	15. Line 45, come clear on what you meant by the	
	strategy.	
	16. Line 48, what sort of milk is produced from tiger nut?	
	'etc' may not be needed in the sentence.	
	17. Line 48, 'used for numerous', change to 'used for	
	other numerous purposes aside consumption as food'.	
	18. Line 49, the authors may want to reverse the words	
	order: 'effectively serve' to 'serve effectively'.	
	19. Line 66, change equipment to equipments.	
	20. Line 67 to 71 is too long a sentence. From line 69,	
	break the sentence into two, that is, 'diesel. The study	
	aimed to determine'	
	21. Lines 79 and 80, the specifications of the reagents –	
	percentage of purity – is more important than the	
	maker (brand), should mentioning the makers at all be	
	considered essential.	
	22. Line 100, to totally dry up, change to: to dry up	
	completely. What method was used to measure the	





www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

moisture content of the dried oil, or is the total dryness	
being speculated?	
23. Line 137-138, The author should explain in specific	
why the calorific value, carbohydrate and fat content	
makes the tiger nut tuber good feedstock for biofuels	
production.	
24. Line 143, change 'nut' to tuber.	
25. Line 144-145, elucidate further why the odour and	
colour makes the oil favourable for biodiesel	
production. What do these properties add for meeting	
the ASTM or other standards for biodiesel?	
26. Line 153, specify the high yielding ones.	
27. Line 166, specify the standard you referred to.	
28. Line 171, specify the lower values – viscosity.	
29. Line 179, the adulteration referred to, is this to	
indicate the purity of the tiger nut biodiesel or the	
intentional act of adding unwanted chemical to fuel?	
30. Line 182, the reference to guideline on classification	
was not cited and not fully stated. The author should	
state how referencing the US guideline is useful for	
the study, considering it was undertaken in Nigeria,	
and the study is meant to promoting biodiesel as	
alternative fuel in Nigeria. Can the US guideline be an	
inspiration for such guidelines in the case of Nigeria	
and other aspiring biofuel countries?	
31. Line 183/184, what reasons will the authors offer for	
why the flash points for B30 and B40 are not good	
blends for use. The author should further elucidate on	

the assertion about these blends and in comparison to other blends they consider having better flash points.

SCIENCEDOMAIN international



www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Is there a procedural or innate physiochemical characteristic of the blend informing this result, if yes, what can be done to achieve improved flash points?
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 107, the authors may want to change the initial parenthesis (% FFA) to -% FFA – or merge up the two, using a comma: (% FFA, as oleic).
Optional/General comments	 Tie the conclusion to specific countries, rather than the blanket tropical countries, or give example. Check the citation of et al. within the text and ensure compliance to guideline, possibly just stating et al. (2000), will suffice without the comma. The Acronym – ASTM –, specify the full meaning in the first instance where it is mentioned in the paper.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous Reviewer
Department, University & Country	