

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102803
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF SELECTED PARAMETERS ON THE PRODUCT YIELDS OF BROOM WEED (SIDA ACUTA) PYROLYSIS
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is. The reviewer has not found yet about broom weed pyrolysis in any recently literatures. However the method and parameters already mentioned in many literatures.</p> <p>2. Yes. It is.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is. However the authors did not mention the heating rate for the pyrolysis reaction. In addition, the choice of time interval that too short, that resulted not much different trend for every result.</p> <p>6. The authors listed many literatures in the references, however the discussion only repeated the same references with the same sentences in all subsections of results and discussion: "... According to the reviewed literature, it was observed that the quantity of char produced decreases with an increase in pyrolysis temperature [2;1;4]..."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is. There are only several grammatical errors in this manuscript.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	This manuscript is only doing experiment to investigate effect of pyrolysis temperature at specific time on the products yield. As thermochemical process, pyrolysis temperature is the main parameter for investigate. However, this manuscript only considering this main parameter. Time is not much investigated due to the range of time used in this manuscript was too short, usually it can reach 1 hour to get more result for pyrolysis. The short range of time resulted the same trend for each time of pyrolysis used in this manuscript, and the authors only repeated the same style of discussion for different subsections in results and discussion. Furthermore, there is not much discussion with relevant references presented by authors in this manuscript.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hesti Wijayanti
Department, University & Country	Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia