| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_IRJPAC_46340** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Physicochemical Analysis of Moringa Oleifera Seeds** |
| 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 | | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | *Moringa oleifera* should be italicised throughout the work<br>Line 5: Abstract not Abatract<br><br>INTRODUCTION<br>Line 24: "instead" should be removed<br>Line 24: statement not clear and not well presented<br>Line 34: "and" should be inserted after "ethanol" before "contains"<br><br>EXTRACTION PROCEDURE<br>It is suggested that volume measurement should be expressed in $cm^3$ instead of L and ml<br>Line 66: multiply instead of multiple<br>Line 66: percentage oil yield instead of percentage yield oil<br>PHYSICOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS<br>The formula for calculating each parameter not given (acid value….etc)<br>Line 100: vigorously shaken as against shaked vigorously<br>TABLE 2<br>Units for iodine and acid value not given<br><br>DISCUSSION<br>Line 128: "in" should be removed<br><br>REFERENCES<br>Line 160 and 169: same reference<br>Line 166: reference not captured in the main body of the work<br>Line 186: should be Gideon and Richardson 2010 in the main body not Gideon et al 2010<br>Line 202: Nweze and Nwafor 2014 not Nweze et al 2014 | Thank you for your valuable comment. All corrections have been performed. |
| **Optional/General** comments | Good paper but the discussion is scanty. Some of the permissible or safe limit standards should have been compared too. | |

**PART 2:**

| | **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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |