

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95320
Title of the Manuscript:	Soxhlet extraction of Spirogyra sp. as an energy source and physicochemical characterization of produced biodiesel
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Major revision is advised to author(s) of the manuscript titled: Soxhlet extraction of Spirogyra sp. as an energy source and physicochemical characterization of produced biodiesel</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, with revision to fix little inconsistencies</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reviewer Comments for Rev_IJECC_95320_Tul_A manuscript title: Soxhlet extraction of Spirogyra sp. as an energy source and physicochemical characterization of produced biodiesel.</p> <p>Reviewer's #X. General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The reviewer recommends to author(s) for a more suitable title to be selected for the article. The abstract should briefly state the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major conclusions. Therefore, an abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. It is suggested to author(s) to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction. The necessity and innovation (Soxhlet extraction isn't an innovation) of the article should be presented in the Introduction. It is suggested to add articles entitled: "Improvements on Semi Critical Assisted-Solvent Extraction of Biocrude Oil from Spirogyra sp Macro Algae". Chavez-Gil T., Sobhi H. F., and Pacheco-Laracuenta A. 2018. American Journal of Biochemistry and Biotechnology. 14(2), 124-136. DOI: 10.3844/ajbbsp.2018.124.136. "Mixed-Polarity Azeotropic Solvents for Efficient Extraction of Lipids from Nannochloropsis Microalgae". Long R. D. and Abdelkader E. 2011. American Journal of Biochemistry and Biotechnology. 7(2), 70-73. ISSN 1553-3468 to guide the authors on the physical chemistry analysis of Spirogyra macroalgae extracted biomass (algal oil). The current major defect of this study is the debate or Argument which is not clear stated in the manuscripts' introduction session. Hence, the scientific contribution appears to be weak in the whole manuscript sections. I would suggest the author(s) to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument with more clarity. It is suggested to author(s) to compare their results of the present research with some 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>similar studies which had been done before on similar algae strain (Spirogyra).</p> <p>8. The author(s) are recommended to elaborate and present more explanations and data interpretations that must be added for the Results because the current data that's not enough (see the reference AJBB. 2018. 14(2), 124-136. DOI: 10.3844/ajbb.2018.124.136).</p> <p>9. The use of two pure and mixed solvents for oil extraction, deserves a particular analysis on the chemical or physical properties that could affect the process in terms of reliability, sustainability, and efficiency.</p> <p>10. I recommend the author(s) to make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your manuscript, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously.</p> <p>11. Please be more specific on your conclusion's part by describing it with more detail.</p> <p>12. You guys should enhance your contributions, limitations, and underscore the scientific value added of your work, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and the future studies planned in this session.</p> <p>13. A detailed (or briefly) description of experiments is always necessary to introduce and motivate the reader to follow the author's research methods.</p> <p>14. The number of references (33) are not enough to support a rigorously research that allows the author(s) to validate their findings and compare their results accordingly.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Tulio Chavez-Gil
Department, University & Country	Coppin State University, United States of America