

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_88797
Title of the Manuscript:	BIODIESEL PROCESS OPTIMIZATION USING KARIYA POD-HUSKS BIO-CATALYZED
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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	<p>Studies on biofuel are gaining traction owing to pollution mitigation and energy security potentials of the bio-based clean fuels. Thus, present study is quite relevant to the energy industry and developing countries where energy access is low. The authors attempted to investigate the optimization of biodiesel production from an indigenous biomass feedstock (KARIYA POD-HUSKS) via soxhlet and transesterification techniques. The manuscript is well written and the results are quite informative. I therefore recommend it for publication after the following concerns are addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors should show the picture of the indigenous Kariya pod-husks used in the study to help the native readers understand the biomass sensory and physicochemical properties. 2. Table 2 and Table should be separated by double margin. 3. Authors claimed that "The average oil yield obtained in this study was 32.55%. The average oil yield in this study was more than the values (23.15-30.53%) reported by Oluwadare and Adeniyi (2015) using the same solvent for kariya oilseed, and more than 25.11 % reported by Okeleye and Betiku (2019)." <p>Authors should provide reasons for this discrepancy.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adefarati Oloruntoba
Department, University & Country	China University of Petroleum, China