



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. I see that in the second version of the article, the authors practically only correct some errors in English, but they do not answer or say anything about the other observations, such as the one about Fig. 1, that the two referees see no purpose in it. Also, why the measurement of methane is not mentioned, being most important to know what is the amount produced, in addition to the other gases. And explain why the use of potash can increase biogas production. That is, the hypothesis about using potash.</p> <p>2. Make the corrections in yellow in the text.</p> <p>3. On the other hand, the references in the text must be ordered in increasing numerical sequence: [1], [2], [3], etc.</p>	<p>The measurement of methane (biogas) was mentioned in fig.1.</p> <p>“Digester B1 (4% of the substrate) had the least production of biogas with average production of 14.90m³/day while digester B9 (12% of the substrate) produced the highest quantity of biogas with average production of 26.98m³/day.”</p> <p>The measurement of other gases is not part of scope of study. This shows that potash may have boosted the production of the biogas since potash acts as catalyst in reactions.</p> <p>The references in the text have been correctly numbered.</p>