

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes the manuscript important for scientific community. It helps in many regions such as Environment, Plution, Energy, Economics,and others. It shows the impotence between the products and the use and reuse espicialy energy. Also the Agricultural products and its imoptant reuse and economic feed back.</p> <p>Yes the title of the article suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is mainl comprehensive. Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate. The the manuscript is scientifically correct Although the the references are sufficient and recent but is better to addmore recent references as the study is interesting.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Good scientific important work	

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:	Shadia El Rafie
Department, University & Country	National Research Center, Egypt