

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102044
Title of the Manuscript:	Simulation and Optimization of Bio-methanol Production from Steam Gasification of Sugarcane Bagasse using Aspen Plus
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The research aim is satisfactorily expressed, and the rationale for the work is clearly stated and establishes the relevance of the work within a broader context. The manuscript is thus, relevant to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article gives a very good gist of the work, and is thus, comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the paper with its sub-section is clear and consistent, and the research process is easy to follow.</p> <p>5. The text is written with an appropriate academic style and the format, citation and referencing, are adequately done. Good research gaps are identified from the array of literature that the authors reviewed. The analytical and statistical methods undertaken are good, and the results are discussed in relation to a few similar works done earlier. The conclusion is based on the data presented in the manuscript.</p> <p>6. The paper is well-written and quite documented with a few recent references.</p> <p>The following reference materials may be useful: Sugarcane bagasse gasification: Simulation and analysis of different operating parameters, fluidizing media, and gasifier types (2019) Ingrid Lopes Motta, Nahieh Toscano Miranda, Rubens Maciel Filho, Maria Regina Wolf Maciel. <i>Biomass and Bioenergy</i> https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2019.01.051</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English language is quite good, however, there are some corrections that need to be done. Example: Conclusion, Line 5: change "of" to "by" in the sentence "...of the Response Surface Methodology..."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the Conclusion section, there is no need to give an introduction and how the work was done. The conclusion is normally based on the results obtained. Thus, the statement: "Sugarcane bagasse is a potential feedstock for producing transportation fuels because it is readily available. Simulation of bio-methanol production from biomass gasification was carried out, using Aspen Plus Ver. 11 software and Design Expert Ver. 13 software for the optimization of the process" should be deleted.</p> <p>The work done in Aspen would have been more challenging if simulation validation and sensitivity analysis were performed.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nana Sarfo Agyemang Derkyi
Department, University & Country	University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana