



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_50204
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Red Onion Skin Extract as Inhibitor for Gum Formation in Gas Condensates
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	<p>On Abstract: Half of the space was used for introduction (eight out of fourteen lines was used to introduce the research) while methodology, results and conclusion were presented in less than 45 % of total space. On the first sentence where ROSE was first defined all the word should be capitalised (i.e Red Onion Skin Extract (ROSE)), subsequently, the abbreviations can then be used. Introduction: Line 19-20 needs revision, Line 35 needs revision (introduction should be in reported speech or past tense). Line 41-47: It requires redraft of this section. Line 52-54 is not complete. Methodology Line 83: If there is modification to the method of 23, then it should be properly captured in this section. Line 86 tenses was not properly used Line 86-88: How did the author determine the yield of the extracted ROSE? Also the preparation of stock solution in ether should be outlined. (Procedure should be written in a way that it can be reproduce-able by other researchers).</p> <p>Treatment methods of the condensates were not captured in the methodology. What makes a sample treated and another untreated? Percentage inhibition steps are not captured in this section.</p> <p>Results and Discussion All the condensate samples are of different insitu composition judging from their characterisation results. Subsequent analysis show different behaviour to inhibitor at the same dosage. The discussion presented did not factor insitu characterization to other results presented. One would have expected that the source of each should be stressed when discussion related to their behaviour at different treatment levels are under consideration. The influence of the characterization was noticed in inhibitory result presentation. The summary is in Figure 9. The author should tie all results presented with behaviour observed in Figure 9. Deviation in Figure 9 should be properly linked to previous results presented in the body of the manuscript. Reason why different inhibitory behaviour at all dosage should be well spelt out. If some results are inconclusive, it should be stated. It should be noted here that this research is looking at the use of waste as inhibitor, preliminary results show that the behaviour of inhibitor is different at different composition, this research should put a threshold to its usefulness. I am sure subsequently will look at proper dosage and effect of other parameters on inhibitory tendency of ROSE.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>On introduction: Each paragraph is a standalone without continuity when moving from one paragraph to another. Methodology: The methodology Steps or procedure should be described in a way to make reproduce-able easier. Results and Discussion There should a space before units should be written (eg: 25 m/s). As it is, the seven condensate samples have different inhibitory tendencies and are not properly tie to the likely source of the deviations observed. Conclusion should be redrafted to accommodate the nature of the results presented.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kazeem K. SALAM
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria