Dear authors,

Although biodiesel synthesis is not my expertise, but I am a chemical engineer and I read your manuscript carefully, so there are some general things that need to be attended before your work could be accepted for publication in JCSC:

1 The text needs some very serious language revision and also some tiding up (e.g. there is an enormous number of missing blanks between two words, the figure captions are not at the same page with the figure, and similar things).

Revision of English has been done and we hope it now matches the journal standard. Missing blanks between words are probably the consequence of the used version of Word, thus it is now saved as .doc file.

2. The paper deals with a chemical reaction of biodiesel synthesis, but the reaction itself is not explicitly defined. Please, provide it.

The reaction (now Eq.1) and accompanying two sentences were added to Manuscript, Introduction section (Page 2, lines 32-39).

3. The definitions of the conversion and yield are somewhat odd (eqs. 2 and 1). Please, give the fundamental definitions which are a standard in reaction engineering, and then you can derive eqs. 2 and 1 from them.

The eqs. 1 and 2 (now Eqs. 2 and 3) were used to calculate the FAME yield (*Y*FAME) and TAG conversion (*x*TAG) from HPLC peak areas and internal standards. These equations were rewritten in order to be more clear.

4. The abscissa in Fig. 2 should, I guess, be 1/T and not T1. Please, add units!

It was T-1, probably it was too small and thus hardly visible. Units are added.

5. The explanation of Table 1 is not clear. First, what are the numbers in parenthesis? Second, how did you determine the model parameters and from which type of data? All 3 models are dynamic. Did you use the experimental change of xTAG with time, or just the final values?

The numbers in parenthesis are the values of TAG conversion degree at the moment t=0 when the pre-set temperature is reached and the isothermal transesterification starts. This explanation has been added to manuscript, as a Table footnote. The model parameters were adopted from ref. 8, and in mentioned reference the change of xTAG with time was used for determination of parameters values.

6. Regarding the results presented in Table 1 and the conclusion that the IL model is the best, you should take into consideration the fact that the first order model has only 1 fitting parameters, while the other 2 have 3 fitting parameters, each.

Yes, the first order model has only 1 parameter, but the more complex IL model, with more parameters, give the possibility of fine tuning and consequently better agreement with the experimental data. Also, the physical meaning of IL model parameters appears to be more realistic. Heterogeneously catalyzed transesterification is a complex three-phase system (catalyst and two immiscible liquid phases, oil and methanol), thus it is necessary to take into account the chemical reaction between methanol and TAG but also the mass transfer of TAG from oil phase to active sites of the catalyst, and IL model comprises both.

7. From page 16 on you use the term “prepared” for, I guess, freshly prepared catalyst. I suggest that you use “freshly prepared” to be more specific.

Instead of “prepared”, “as-prepared” was used, since that term has already been used in the Manuscript.