

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_97103
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOGAS PRODUCTION FROM CO-DIGESTION OF CATTLE MANURE, ORYZA SATIVA AND PHASEOLUS VULGARIS IN PLUG FLOW DIGESTER
Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)	The manuscript is very interesting, the title and abstract is suitable. Is necessary to check the format of manuscript. Ex. Key words. Table 1 is not necessary...just insert the information on the text and write also per extense. Call the table 2 in the text. The symbol of °C are not equal in the text Insert COD per extense in the first time that appear. The symbols of equation 1 and 2 are not equal to the symbol of the text. Correct the y axis of the figure 2 Figure 6please change y axis by ..TS value (%) and fig. 7 VS value (%) The references are ok The tables they don't need lines and they don't even need to be closed on the sides But in general the text is very good.	
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:	Juliana Steffens
Department, University & Country	URI, Brazil