

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_100502
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILIZATION OF BIFUNCTIONAL CATALYST FOR BIODIESEL PRODUCTION FROM PALM KERNEL OIL
Type of the Article	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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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> <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>The following comments are to be incorporated into the manuscript for improving the manuscript quality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main objective of the work must be written on the more clear and more concise way at the end of introduction section 2. Introduction section must be written on more quality way, i.e. more up-to-date references addressed. Research gap should be delivered on more clear way with directed necessity for the conducted research work, 3. Conclusion section is missing some perspective related to the future research work, quantify main research findings 4. English language should be carefully checked and carefully check paper for language typos 5. Please use the literature background on cleaner production/sustainability (but not self-citations please) to broaden the manuscript foundation. Please develop a better title. This one does not state what is important to catch the prospective reader's attention. 6. Underscore the scientific value-added to your paper in your abstract. Please look at articles we have published for models. Your abstract should clearly state the essence of the problem you are addressing, what you did and what you found and recommend. That would help a prospective reader of the abstract to decide if they wish to read the entire article. 7. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscores the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your results. Highlight the novelty of your study. Clearly discuss what the previous studies that you are referring to are. What are the Research Gaps/Contributions? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	NA	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	NA	

Review Form 1.7

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:	M. Naveenkumar
Department, University & Country	Easwari Engineering College, India