



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. All photographs of the oil samples were applied again, considering that the resting should be made of the same type, of the same transparent, of the same size. Not as presented, one in a mouthful, another in a plastic bottle, another in a plastic cup. Identify each package just below, with the name of each sample, not with letters a, b, c The reader should have a greater ability to identify the oil by name and thus correlate by its color, mainly.</p> <p>2. All spectros should improve resolution.</p> <p>3. In the letter, the name of column X (% of T ...) and Y of Wave Length ... (Wave Number cm-1) must be written.</p> <p>4. All graphics should have the same feature. Not as shown, there is a degree between each wavelength. Others do not. Reading migration or none.</p> <p>5. I believe that, in order of magnitude of the results, these types of notes will be displayed according to types of oil. For example, it is known that castor oil, can be used in biodiesel, is also Jatropha cures, this way, suggestions of use should be, so catalogued, according to their property found. This way it would be better to value the work done in this research.</p> <p>6. After the title of the results and discussion, the authors should present as graphs. For example: In Figures X and Y, the results of the FTIR spectrometric analysis on the various oil samples are tracked.</p> <p>7. Discuss and discuss possible sources of each source of data from other sources, from different sources of oil.</p>	<p>1. Samples were not collected at the same time. The letters a,b, c..... corresponds with names of the seed oils accordingly.</p> <p>2. That has been the highest resolution so far based on the machine used.</p> <p>Not clear</p>