

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96838
Title of the Manuscript:	TEMPERATURE EFFECT ON BIOGAS PRODUCTION FROM CO-DIGESTION OF FOOD WASTE, POTASH AND CATTLE DUNG
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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	yes, since it follows the scientific method by identifying variables and performing statistical analysis. TEMPERATURE EFFECT ON BIOGAS PRODUCTION FROM CO-DIGESTION OF FOOD WASTE, POTASH AND CATTLE COW DUNG although the idea is understandable, the wording is confusing. YES YES, IT IS INTERESTING TO OBSERVE THE POSSIBLE CHANGE IN MICROBIAL ACTIVITY DUE TO TEMPERATURE, HOWEVER, THERE IS NO MENTION OF WHY OR ON WHAT BASIS THIS RELATIONSHIP OF SUBSTRATE INOCULUM AND POTASH CONCENTRATION OCCURS IT IS SUGGESTED TO IMPROVE THE DISCUSSION THROUGH THE ADDITION OF SPECIALIZED ARTICLES.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	THE ARTICLE CONTAINS SPELLING MISTAKES AND SENTENCES ARE NOT UNDERSTANDABLE	
Optional/General comments	IT IS AN INTERESTING WORK BUT IT IS NOT DISCUSSED AND IN THE CONCLUSION A SUMMARY OF RESULTS	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francisco Javier Martínez Valdez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Tecnológica De Tecamac, Mexico