

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_88798
Title of the Manuscript:	KARIYA POD-HUSKS: A NOVEL BIOCATALYST IN BIODIESEL PRODUCTION
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		
Minor REVISION comments	English language should be improved. Tables and figures in introduction may not be presented. Should study different conditions for biodiesel production with catalyst and should conclude the best. Hence at optimized conditions yield may be further more. Include statistical analysis in methodology.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The English in the manuscript has been improved2. The Table and Figure in the introduction is necessary to present different ways of preparing some other biocatalyst and to make the reader of the manuscript to get familiar with the kariya plant and seeds respectively.3. The optimization of the biodiesel process is not captured in the scope of this manuscript.
Optional/General comments	It's a good study but would have further elaborated.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are still further work ongoing in this study which will also be publish when ready.

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)	