

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96393
Title of the Manuscript:	Adsorption of Carotene from Crude Palm Oil by Activated Achalla Clay
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Yes, the idea is interesting and the results are good.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Yes, it is OK.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, it covers the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This article deals with the usage of modified clay in treating Palm oil. The idea is interesting and the results are good. However, the manuscript has not been written well. Here are some comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All the figures should be reformatted. Figures 1 & 2 should be overlaid and its caption must be changed into "FTIR spectra ..." and its Y-axis title should contain %. Section 2.10. Instead of discussing about the concept, it is better to say something about the experimental procedure. At least, that can be given after the scientific concept. The degree symbol is not properly written throughout the manuscript. Section 3.1.2: the use of references in this form is not acceptable. The authors must discuss their own results and then by saying something like: "These findings are consistent with the previous reports" (or something like that) cite some references. <p>The manuscript could be published after some minor corrections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes, it's OK.</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vahid Zare-Shahabadi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran