



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_51471
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF SEED KERNEL FROM JATROPHA CURCAS
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title The title should be change for specific meaning "Sudanese Jatropha curcas L." resp. results about "PHYTOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF SEED KERNEL FROM JATROPHA CURCAS" are depend for clime conditions from Sudan.</p> <p>Abstract The abstract briefly describes the conducted study and introduces the selected results. Abstract is correct.</p> <p>Keyword The keywords describe the solved problematic. The number of words is reasonable.</p> <p>Introduction Introduction is relatively short and not directly relevant to the issue solved. I recommend focusing on studies already carried out in this area also nowadays (authors described only articles max. to year 2013).</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS There the place of a collection and form of samples is described. It would nice to know a mature degree of the Jatropha curcas. Also in the text are not describe approx. value/size of seeds, amount of samples, etc. Authors present that e.g. "Jatropha seed samples were air dried in shade ...", I suggest that it authors all document their procedures and methodologies with figures.</p> <p>Results It is possible to agree with the results as they are presented. Maybe I can suggest only more describe it.</p> <p>References The count and topics of articles in references are suitable, but not complete.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The topic is interesting, but it is not new. There are plenty of articles that are focused on this problematic. If authors bring something new, it should be underlined and thoroughly described and explained in details.</p> <p>The text is almost clear and understandable. In the text are often missing new results about topic.</p> <p>I recommend add another references that are focused on the topic and describe where is difference/benefit of your article.</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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Michal Petrú</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Technical University of Liberec, Czech Republic</i>