

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2616
Title of the Manuscript:	Technological Process of Obtaining Sunflower Oil
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think the research topic is extremely important. However, in the study, sufficient references research was not done and the information obtained was not presented appropriately. After a better research, the text should be corrected formally with more up-to-date literature information.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is insufficient. The study is about the production process of sunflower oil. At this point, the information given in the abstract is about the physiological properties of sunflower oil. The abstract should be a summary of the text in general, so it would be more accurate to briefly mention the production technology stages.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subheadings are not appropriate. The heading 2.13 can be corrected to 3. In addition, there is a problem with the general structure of the text. For example, the font sizes of the headings are not correct and appropriate. The conclusions section should be corrected. Some paragraphs are indented, some are not. A standard should be followed. There are many bullet points in the text. It would be more accurate if these were converted into text. This makes reading difficult and disrupts the flow. Under the title "Morphological structure of the sunflower seed", the characteristics of seeds are mentioned in general. In Table 2, the characteristics of the sunflower are mentioned. Table 2 can be enriched by textualizing it. Also, Table 3 is not connected to any text. A few sentences about oil can be written beforehand. In general, the resolution of the figures is very low, clearer figures can be selected. Non-English texts can be corrected on some texts (Fig 3). There is no reference to sources in the text. This is a very important problem. For example, if images such as Fig 8 are taken from patents, the numbers of these patents should be stated in the legend of figure. Additionally, no figures or tables were included in the text. The conclusion section is not appropriate. In this section, the importance of the study should be briefly mentioned and a few sentences should be said to guide the next studies. However, in this text, the author's own views, which are not related to the text on sunflower oil, are included. This section should be completely corrected.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The information is insufficient. The work should be supported by flow charts and clearer figures. There are also significant technical problems in the text. The suggested corrections regarding the necessary formal corrections are mentioned above.	

[Review Form2](#)

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not appropriate. Most of the references are internet sources and most of them are old. Sufficient literature research has not been done. There are many current studies on the subject on the internet. These articles are not mentioned in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
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:	Begum Guler
Department, University & Country	Kirsehir Ahi Evran University, Turkiye