

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_93356
Title of the Manuscript:	VALORIZATION OF POST-PINEAPPLE HARVESTING RESIDUES AND SAWDUST WASTE INTO FUEL BRIQUETTES
Type of the 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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The focus of the study is highly relevant to agricultural waste valorization and biofuel feedstock development in the developing countries. The authors concisely studied the upgrading of low-value post-pineapple harvesting residues and sawdust waste into high-value fuel briquettes. However, the focus of the results and discussion is not on the selected biomass and some many disjointed information. The authors need to modify the manuscript to enhance its readability in the light of the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors are advised not to use the first or second person pronouns in an academic writing (I, we, you, our). 2. The numbering of the section and subsection is wrong <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction 2. Materials and methods <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Material 2.2 Methods <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1 Humidity 2.2.2 Volatile matter content, 3. Results and discussion 3. Many grammar errors, please check and proofread thoroughly 4. Some sentences need to be restructured. E.g. the below sentence is hard to be understood... <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Specifically, it will be a question of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterize pineapple leaves collected from crop fields; • Formulate fuel briquettes with pineapple leaves, sawdust waste and a binder; • Test manufactured fuel briquettes. 5. Under materials and methods, authors mentioned Fresh water hyacinth, cassava waste as biomass collected for the experiment, meanwhile the selected biomass in the study objectives are pineapple leaves and sawdust waste 6. Some non-English text also appear in the manuscript ...” Il est différent de carbone total qui est la somme du carbone fixe et le carbone contenu dans la partie volatilisé.” 7. M is given in the formulas, but what it means is not defined 8. The results and discussion section needs a complete overhaul. For example, “For these different analyses, the moisture content, the values of the three parameters (volatile matter content, ash content and fixed carbon content) that will be presented were analyzed on dry matter.” Which analyses are the authors 	

Review Form 1.6

	9. The conclusion also lack authors' recommendations. talking about?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	A serious edit is needed, structure and grammar checks are vital.	

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:	Adefarati Oloruntoba
Department, University & Country	College of Mechanical and Transportation Engineering, China University of Petroleum Beijing, China