

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_96927
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of energy potential by anaerobic digestion of agricultural residues in agro-ecological zone 5 in Benin.
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Definitely, yes. Through scientific methods, the manuscript shows the potency of various residues found in the studied area, measured from several parameters which ultimately can estimate the energy potential. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	From a literature search, the article has not been published in any journals. However, some typos or incorrect grammars are still found in the manuscript. I highlighted them with yellow block. Figure 3 is unclear, both the parameters inside the graph and the x-y axis.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Mujiburohman
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia