

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_91913
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of supercritical parameters on phenol content
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:

<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>

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>Comments: Your article appears to be of interest to a wide community of researchers studying the extraction of compounds from natural sources, and to further promote its visibility, we encourage you to consult published articles related to this topic. DOI: 10.33736/bjrst.234.2014 https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules26051489 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03795-6 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2020.01.025 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-37171-9 DOI: 10.3390/molecules26051489</p> <p>Title: The title must be modified since it does not express the complete content of the manuscript</p> <p>Introduction section: The introduction does not provide enough background. The Introduction is too short. The themes and results available in the literature are not presented in detail. Make a major improvement to the introduction section, including strong rationalization on newness of research with valid and clear comparison to previous reports.</p> <p>Methods: It would be interesting if the authors included in the manuscript the PFD or schematic representation of the supercritical extraction process.</p> <p>Results section: The results obtained are not thoroughly discussed scientifically. The results obtained are not compared with those available in the literature. A comparison table with at least 10 other documents should be discussed, to highlight the results of this work.</p> <p>Conclusions: It is recommended to considerably improve the conclusions based on the objectives of the work</p> <p>References: Increase and update bibliographic references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Julian Cruz Olivares
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Mexico State, Mexico