

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is found to be useful for scientific community. Title is found to be appropriate. The abstract needs to be refined. Language corrections is to be done. Abstract should convey the complete insight of the article. Subsections and structure of the article is found to be appropriate Manuscript is found to be scientifically correct. Some of the articles are found to be old. Recent articles may be added and some of the references are not cited appropriately. It is suggested to use any reference management tool. The following corrections may be incorporated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion section needs to be refined highlighting the outcomes. • Reasons for selecting the feedstock and its availability analysis needs to be mentioned briefly. • Reasons for selecting RSM for optimization needs to be mentioned. • Description of variables affecting the extraction process and reasons for selecting the state variables may be mentioned. • Error analysis in experiments to be added. • Language corrections to be made throughout the article. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunil S
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateshwara College of Engineering, India