

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_96376
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Solvent Oil Extraction from Sandbox (Hura crepitans Linn.) Seeds
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript added to the body of existing knowledge. It is a well-researched article. The flow in the introduction is welcoming. The method and materials section was well explained that allows for reproducibility while the results and discussion segment unveils the strength of the author(s) at comparative analysis. 2. The title is alright 3. Yes 4. The subsections are appropriate, structure of manuscript inclusive 5. Yes, it is 6. They are sufficient There are some minor omissions that must be noted by the author(s) as revealed in the reviewed manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	satisfactory	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fowotade Sulayman Akanbi
Department, University & Country	Hussaini Adamu Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria