

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Much of which is in the article is already known, but there are omissions from the article such as the energy value of the biogas and whether it varies from the different concentrations of the substrate and over time. Yes Yes Yes Yes</p> <p>There are many more references that could be cited. Ref. # 6 is clearly wrong. Ref to Makhura et al is # 3 not 9. Ref. # 4 is missing. The references should be checked</p> <p>No cost data is given about the cost of the digester, the collection of food waste and cow dung or the cost of potash. Regarding the use of thermophilic bacteria, usually the substrate has to be heated (with biogas) to attain the correct temperature range, whereas in the tropics the ambient temperature is usually sufficient for mesophilic bacteria to function. The author cautions about the use of the slurry. However, the digestion process kills about 95% of the harmful bacteria and it is an excellent fertilizer and can be handled safely.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, but this seems like a student exercise. The results are already known.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Biogas contains 50% to 70% methane. Methane has an energy value of 50-55 MJ/kg (35-40 MJ/m <sup>3</sup> ). This should be stated. In normal practice, the dung etc. and water are added daily or weekly and the slurry is collected at the same time for use or storage.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Keith Openshaw</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sokoine University of Agriculture, USA</b>