

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116057
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardisation of centrifugation method for virgin coconut oil production and comparison of quality parameters of the recovered oil
Type of the Article	Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The abstract of the paper is quite good. An introduction is not very clear to the reader. It's clumsy. In 2nd paragraph of the introduction section, various techniques... what the author conveys to the reader from these findings. All paragraphs of the introduction sections are not in flow. It shows meaningless. At the end of the introduction paragraph, the author does not demonstrate it is our work.</p> <p>But in materials and methods, the first line is repeated from the last line of the introduction section. Materials and methods are not clear. It's confused. Please make the table or diagram representation. Even, the centrifuge make and model are not mentioned. Pls, avoid the reference to materials and methods. As a result and discussion, Findings related discussion needs. But here, the finding has one paragraph and the discussion is another paragraph. It is not correlated to any findings.</p> <p>Why does the author demonstrate this much repetition? If more than 12000 RPM what kind of yield get. Findings and Discussion are not easy to understand to the reader.</p> <p>Overall, should Refine the whole manuscript and avoid repetition of sentences/words.</p> <p>Note: The author should refine the manuscript with English corrections. Add more images of oil separation in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	N. R. Dhineshabu
Department, University & Country	T. John Institute of Technology, India