



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><i>Moringa oleifera</i> should be italicised throughout the work Line 5: Abstract not Abatract</p> <p>INTRODUCTION Line 24: "instead" should be removed Line 24: statement not clear and not well presented Line 34: "and" should be inserted after "ethanol" before "contains"</p> <p>EXTRACTION PROCEDURE It is suggested that volume measurement should be expressed in cm<sup>3</sup> instead of L and ml Line 66: multiply instead of multiple Line 66: percentage oil yield instead of percentage yield oil</p> <p>PHYSICOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS The formula for calculating each parameter not given (acid value....etc) Line 100: vigorously shaken as against shaken vigorously</p> <p>TABLE 2 Units for iodine and acid value not given</p> <p>DISCUSSION Line 128: "in" should be removed</p> <p>REFERENCES Line 160 and 169: same reference Line 166: reference not captured in the main body of the work Line 186: should be Gideon and Richardson 2010 in the main body not Gideon et al 2010 Line 202: Nweze and Nwafor 2014 not Nweze et al 2014</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tsado Daniel Babanma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal university of technology Minna, Nigeria</b>