

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_108225
Title of the Manuscript:	SUPERCRITICAL FLUID EXTRACTION: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	review

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</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>Yes, although it is another review article on supercritical fluid extraction, it is yet a nicely written brief description of the methodology with a short summarization on recent examples being given in the literature</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>there are too many subsection, text should be combined into bigger in size sections</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Generally speaking yes, it is nicely written in a clear form of communication. Still there are some small entries that needs revision (some examples will be given below)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction, sentence "Continuous extraction done.." needs revision Sec. 2 in sentence "unequal.." the form that is unnecessary for grammar reasons, otherwise the last part of the sentence should be rewritten Last sentence in sec. 2 needs additional citation First sentence in sec. 4 need to be rewritten The entry in table 1 for water should be given with same number of significant digits as done for other Too many section is provided Sources of figures should be more accurate and must be listed in general reference list The source for fig. 2 is probably not the researchgate, it is rather published there additionally Sec. 4.2 the list should be given in a form of bullet points rather than sentences Sec. 4.3 in both first two paragraphs the same information on SC-CO2 is unnecessarily given Sec. 4.4 the names of the compound like CO2 or NO should not be given with capital letters Sec. 5 sentence "modification..." at the end a single form of a word research should be given Spelling in title of sec. 7 Sec. 7.2 spelling in first entry and last entry is not fully clear for me what refers to Sec. 8 last paragraph: please explain what SCWG stands for; also the reference here is incorrect, authors are given with their names but not family names Style in reference section is not uniform, please correct it Reference Zully ... should not contain publisher (MDPI) in the list</p>	

[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:	Dariusz Guziejewski
Department, University & Country	University of Lodz, Poland