

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100693
Title of the Manuscript:	Variability of physiochemical properties of pig manure with added wood shavings during open-air dumping and Windrow Composting
Type of the Article	Review 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 '**lac k of N o velt y**', 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>L = Line</p> <p>L106: "2.3Measurement "-> missing space</p> <p>L145-148: "The highest and the lowest peak temperatures we both experienced in the open-air dumping treatments. The highest peak temperature in the experiment (63.4°C) was experienced in the 90:10 % dumping (D90%) on the 8th day of the experiment while the lowest (40.8°C) was experience in the 100% dumping (D100%) on the 4th day of the experiment." -> This information does not match Figure 3. According to Fig. 3 the highest peak of temperature was +63oC for D90 and C90 on the day 2. The lowest peak of temperature was +26oC for C100 and C90 on the day 20. Fig. 3: after 7 days C100 and C90 had the same pattern. Wood shaving addition had no influence after 7 days in windrow composting. Why? Fig. 3: until day 6 D90 and C90 had the same pattern. The process composting/dumping had no influence until day 6 when wood shaving was added. Why?</p> <p>-> Fig. 4: Why C90 had the highest pH values? Why D100 had the lowest pH values? -> How could the lignin present in the wood influence the result? - > Why did the pH increase over the days in all cases?</p> <p>L178-179: "The lowest and the highest EC was recorded in C90% (1.95 178 7 µS/cm and 5.75 µS/cm respectively) on day 1 and day 20 of the experiment respectively" -> This information does not match Figure 5. -> highest EC was recorded on day 10.</p> <p>-> Figure 6: Missing points D100 and D90. Incomplete. The authors changed the caption (legend), it got confusing, it looks wrong.</p> <p>-> Table 2: Why did the result not show any significant difference even though the differences were clearly observed in the Figures? I didn't understand.</p> <p>-> Figure 7: The authors changed the caption (legend) again, it got confusing. Use the same caption (legend) as Figure 1 and 2 for all figures. Why D100 had the highest moisture content during the days? Why C90 had the lowest</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>moisture content during the days?</p> <p>-> Figure 8: Does the y-axis correspond to VS or TOC? I think graphics should be separate for VS and TOC. I didn't understand, it seems wrong.</p> <p>-> I suggest "results" and "discussion" together -> "results and discussion". L304: "during the mesophilic phase" -> what is the "mesophilic phase"? What are the other phases? Explain.</p> <p>L334: "The authors acknowledge..." -> Separate this paragraph from the conclusion.</p> <p>-> References: Check that all references cited throughout the text are in the list and that all references in the list are cited throughout the text.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Thiago Simonato Mozer
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil