

UNIVERSITAS  
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

rachmat subagyo &lt;rachmatsubagyo@ulm.ac.id&gt;

---

**[AE] Editor Decision**

1 pesan

**Muji Setiyo** <setiyo.muji@ummgl.ac.id>

21 Januari 2023 pukul 11.46

Kepada: Helen Riupassa <helenriu01@gmail.com>, "Hendry Y. Nanlohy" <hynanlohy@gmail.com>, Suyatno Suyatno <suyatnoarief@gmail.com>, Andi Sanata <andisanata@unej.ac.id>, Trismawati Trismawati <trismawati@upm.ac.id>, Rachmat Subagyo <rachmatsubagyo@ulm.ac.id>, Satworo Adiwidodo <satworo.adiwidodo@polinema.ac.id>, Muhammad Akhlis Rizza <muh.akhlis@polinema.ac.id>, Masaki Yamaguchi <masakiyama@keio.jp>

Dear Helen Riupassa, Hendry Y. Nanlohy, Suyatno Suyatno, Andi Sanata, Trismawati Trismawati, Rachmat Subagyo, Satworo Adiwidodo, Muhammad Akhlis Rizza, Masaki Yamaguchi:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Automotive Experiences, "Diffusion burning rate characteristics of crude coconut oil droplet blend with bio-additives from aromatic oils".

Our decision is: **Revisions Required**

Please revise your manuscript carefully, the revision process requires two major documents:

- The first is the revised manuscript highlighting all the modifications made following the recommendations received from the reviewers (example of [revised manuscript](#)).
- The second is a letter listing the authors' responses illustrating they have addressed all the concerns of the reviewers and editors (example of [response letter](#)).

These two documents should be drafted carefully. The authors of the manuscript can agree or disagree with the comments of the reviewers and are not always obliged to implement their recommendations, but they should in all cases provide a well-argued justification for their course of action.

You are expected to return the revised paper no later than **2 weeks** from your receiving this notification.

Muji Setiyo  
Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang  
[setiyo.muji@ummgl.ac.id](mailto:setiyo.muji@ummgl.ac.id)

-----  
Reviewer A:

**Abstract**

Include research data as evidence that the combustion rate is increasing and contributing

**Introduction**

Explain:

- Why was CCO chosen as fuel, even though CCO is cooking oil,
- Why are CvO and EO chosen as additives, while CvO and EO are used as medicine/health, which have high commercial value.
- Include economic reasons, so that research results are more useful.

**Method**

The sample is too small, it is necessary to develop more samples to be tested, so that the optimum value of the role of additive CvO and EO can be known. Does the addition of the maximum additive show the optimum combustion rate or not. Why?

## Result and Discussion

Figures 4, 6, 7 burning rate evolution of the developed samples need to be explained in more detail:

1. About the meaning of each fire color image from various samples from 0.1 – 0.7 (s)
2. What does time 0 (s) burning rate 1 (mm<sup>2</sup>/s) to time 0.7 (s) burn rate 0 (mm<sup>2</sup>/s), etc., for each sample
3. When it was below 0.1 (s) the burning rate of CCO with 300 ppm EO increased sharply the highest compared to the other samples, after that it dropped dramatically (and allegedly with the fastest burning rate, why did that happen?)

## Conclusion

Conclusions are made short, concise and clear from the results of the research in one paragraph, not describing it again.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

-----

Reviewer E:

Reference Title: Diffusion burning rate characteristics of crude coconut oil droplet blend with bio-additives from aromatic oils

The reference manuscript is interesting. However, a major revision is essential due to the following.

- The manuscript is fully loaded with typography mistakes. Hence it is strongly recommended to revise the entire manuscript.
- Page 3: Figure.1 Struktur
- Page 3: Line no 21. Figure 1 shows the research scheme. What is the figure, and where is the research scheme?
- Page 5: Result dan Discussion. It should be Result and Discussion
- Page 6: Lines 1, 5. H<sub>2</sub>O it should be H<sub>2</sub>O
- Page 9: Line 5, mm<sup>2</sup>/s it should be mm<sup>2</sup>/s
- Page 11: Line 16. transesterification and pre-heating [[xx] xx]. What is [xx] represent?
- Page 11: Lines 3, 4: Check the statement once.
- Using the nomenclature/abbreviations/subscript/superscript in the manuscript is strongly recommended.
- The total sum of % of composition from GCMS test should be equal to 100. In your study, the total sum is not equal to 100. Kindly check.
- From table.1, More than 16% of compositions are missing from coconut oil. Kindly check and update
- The material and Method section should undergo a significant revision as there is no clear explanation of the experimental procedure.
- Experimental instrument specifications with their uncertainty analysis should be included in the revised manuscript.
- Conclusions should be revised. The present conclusions don't contribute any significant output. And observed many mistakes.
- The authors should include and discuss the significant oil properties.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

This message (including any attachments) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is non-public, proprietary, privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law or may constitute as attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, notify us immediately by telephone and (i) destroy this message if a facsimile or (ii) delete this message immediately if this is an electronic communication.

---

[Automotive Experiences](#)



**A-8150-Article Text\_Manuscript-29439-1-4-20221113.docx**

1114K