



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_46941
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical, Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) Analysis and Cold Saponification of Wild grapes (Lannea microcarpa) Seed Oil
Type of the 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	<p>In the abstract standardize the notation of GC-MS, since in line 8 it appears with a notation different from that of line 17. It does not need to emphasize the experimental design used. To establish in the summary the percentage of major fatty acids as well as the percentage of saturated and unsaturated.</p> <p>Introduction: make mention of other works where they talk about that fruit based on the importance of this study. Are there data on chemical composition? Minerals, fatty acids, etc? In case there were to be highlighted in that work.</p> <p>Material and method: detail some aspects of the sampling, such as the coordinates of sampling location, number of samples taken, how many repetitions and type of experimental design.</p> <p>As for the extraction to calculate the yield, it must be shown how many times the extraction was made. It is recommended that they be made in triplicates in order to obtain a positive performance result. The performance should be expressed with the mean value and the standard deviation.</p> <p>Line 69. The performance equation must be standardized and the same typeface.</p> <p>Line 82. Standardize the formula with the same type of letter (See the author's guide).</p> <p>Line 94. When talking about CG-MS the first time you use these acronyms, you must specify what it means for the entire scientific community to understand. standardize throughout the manuscript as CG-MS since it sometimes appears as CGMS.</p> <p>There is a substantial doubt in the work. To identify the fatty acids was CG-MS used? Why CG-FID was not used, since the initial chromatogram seems to be CG-FID. On the other hand, in the methodology are not well defined chromatographic conditions used as type of column, patterns used and purity of the same, etc.</p> <p>Table 2. Do not place the molecular formula of the fatty acids but use the proper nomenclature C16: 0, C18: 0, etc.</p> <p>The discussion is very poor. What is the importance of those percentages of fatty acids in the oil? It would be good to specify which ones are saturated and which ones are unsaturated. There is no comparison with other jobs. In the case that they are not of the same fruit, they could be compared with the same family.</p> <p>Improve the conclusion responding to the biotechnological importance of this oil, always responding to the objectives.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ismael Montero Fernández
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Roraima, Brazil