



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_56402
Title of the Manuscript:	BIODIESEL SYNTHESIS FROM WASTE COOKING OIL USING PERIWINKLE SHELLS AS CATALYST
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The R_1, R_2 and R_3 are not defined for equation 1. 2. Numbering of subtitles under 2.2. Methods; is not correct. 3. In section, 2.2.4 Reduction of free fatty acid (Esterification process), the amounts of raw material are not presented. 4. 3.1 Characterization should be 3.1 WCO Characterization 5. The description of the used GC apparatus is not presented. 6. What is the method which used to determine the GC results? 7. It is not known that GC used for determination of triglycerides in the produced biodiesel samples, give the method and reference. 8. In Table 4, columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 should be omitted. 9. What is the ratio of methanol to oil, is it molar ratio. 10. In section, 3.2.1 Effect of Methanol Oil ratio (MOR), the decrease of yield with increase of methanol is not explained. 11. The explanation of the decrease of the % yield with increase reaction temperature as the alcohol ratio decreases is not suitable since there is a reflux condenser to avoid alcohol evaporation. 12. Table 5 and Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8 contain repeated results. 13. Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8 are crowded and not clear. 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nahed K. Attia
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Giza, Egypt