

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_109205
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of the traditional process of oil extraction from sardine viscera (<i>Sardina pilchardus</i>) in the Far North Region-Cameroon by the Response Surface Methodology
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, based on the introduction, the optimisation using RSM carried out in this manuscript might be important to Far North region of Cameroon for improving quality of locally produced sardine oils.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, but some revision is required. (Please refer to comment below)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. Some revision must be done before published.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The values of some optimal condition are not tally with the value in the 3.2.4. Author did not explain the desirability value in the result and discussion. Author should discuss the desirability value in the result and discussion if authors want to include it as result. 2. Authors should show the predicted data in the result & discussion and compare with actual data in the main text before this conclusion is made. It is insufficient to use current data to demonstrate the relationship between the actual and predicted data. 3. The conclusion is not same as the conclusion in the end of manuscript. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction is well written. The background is summarized. The reason for optimizing traditional extraction method but not green method is explained. 2. Authors might need to show any data or reference for their observations on the field (far Nord region) and preliminary analyses. 3. What is the limitation of the traditional method of extraction? Please briefly discuss to show the research gap and importance of this research. <p>Method</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Table 2, the number after X1, X2 and X3 should be subscripted. X3 is same row as X2, it should be same row as settling time. 2. In 2.5 Extraction of total lipids, the lipids are extracted by a ternary mixture of chloroform, methanol, and water in defined proportions, but variable during the extraction. What does "variable" mean? Is it mean different proportions of chloroform, methanol, and water? If the proportions of chloroform, methanol, and water is different during the extraction, please explain the reason. If the proportions are fixed, please include the proportions in the manuscript so that another researcher can reproduce the experiments. 3. In 2.5 Extraction of total lipids, the formula for the percentage of total lipids is missing. <p>Result and discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Table 3, the number in Y1, Y2 and Y3 should be subscripted. In the main text, the number in X1, X2 and X3 also not subscripted 2. In Table 3, why the numbers in run 15-17 is bold? 3. In Fig 2, is this contour plot or factor plot? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>4. In Fig 3, the text in fig b is not English. The text for Y axis is also missing.</p> <p>5. In Fig 3, the fig c for peroxide value is not in the manuscript. I cannot analyze the result that described in main text.</p> <p>6. Why the relationship between settling time and other variables is not showed in Fig 3?</p> <p>7. The authors listed the optimal conditions as temperature at 95°C, cooking time 17.02min, viscera mass/water volume ratio 100:152 g/ml and settling time 96min. Are these values predicted or experimental values? I suggest authors to run a validation test and compare predicted or experimental values to demonstrate the adequacy of the regression equation.</p> <p>8. As the difference between adjusted R² and predicted R² is very large, I would like to suggest authors to list the predicted or experimental values for each run in Table 3 or new table to show whether correlation is satisfactory.</p> <p>9. Settling time is also one of the variables, why the effect of settling time is not discussed?</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>1. The conclusion reflects upon the aims. The conclusion is made based on the major finding and data discussed in the result.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is well written and organized.</p> <p>2. The length of the manuscript is adequate and meets the criteria required by the publication</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yeong Hwang Tan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Institute of Sustainable Energy, Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Malaysia</p>