

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_118829
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate analysis, extraction, and characterization of oil from Terminalia catappa fruit
Type of the 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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

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> <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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community, the authors aiming to analyse the proximate composition of the seeds of tropical almonds and extract and characterize the oil from <i>Terminalia catappa</i> seeds and mesocarp. The authors concluded that <i>Terminalia catappa</i> seeds exhibit a high level of most chemical components, making them a promising raw material for various industries. Furthermore, they also serve as beneficial dietary supplements and should be encouraged in diets. 2. Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The text is clear and easy to read. 6. The list of references is large and recently. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Attention at the reference list. Some names of species are not italic. Please to correct. Example:</p> <p>Anand, A., Divya, N., & Kotti, P. (2015). An updated review of <i>Terminalia catappa</i>. <i>Pharmacognosy reviews</i>, 9(18), 93. DOI: 10.4103/0973-7847.162103</p> <p>Chikezie, U. N. (2017). Phytochemical and proximate composition of <i>Tetracarpidium conophorum</i> (African Walnut) seeds. <i>International Journal of Research Studies in Biosciences</i>, 5(10), 25-31. DOI: 10.24297/jbt.v7i1.6411</p> <p>Menkiti, M. C., Agu, C. M., Ejikeme, P. M., & Onyelucheya, O. E. (2017). Chemically improved <i>Terminalia catappa</i> L. oil: A possible renewable substitute for conventional mineral transformer oil. <i>Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering</i>, 5(1), 1107-1118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2017.01.037</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:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania