

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_85532
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Studies on the Physicochemical Characteristics and Lipid Contents of Desert Date (Balanites aegyptiaca (L.) Del) Kernel and Pulp Oils
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.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Author reported studies on Comparative Studies on the Physicochemical Characteristics and Lipid Contents of Desert Date (Balanites aegyptiaca (L.) Del) Kernel and Pulp Oils. The manuscript is good innovative and would add little novelty to the literature.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Page 1: The reference (Akakuru et al., 2017) must be given a serial number within the reference numbering. Paragraph 'Apparatus' should be inserted. Procedure part should be written more clearly. The purity of all chemicals and origin should be mentioned. In the tables, some RSD% values are rejected because they exceed than 5%. The number of samples analyzed (N=?) should be included in each table. The work needed more accuracy in finding results. All Tables should be formatted. All references should be written in the same style and according to the type of journal. In most places. English needs to be polished.	(a) We have given serial number to the reference. (b) I think there is no point of inserting apparatus because this not a project. (c) All the procedures are well presented. (d) The purity and origin of chemicals were already stated. However, they have been highlighted. (e) The number of samples analyzed is already stated (see Table 1). (f) The type of statistical tools used already presented (see 2.8). (g) We have checked again and again for any typographical and grammatical errors.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is generally interesting and well written. My overall opinion on the text is positive and I have found only few technical issues that should be corrected.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	