

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106660
Title of the Manuscript:	A STEP INTO FUTURE FUEL INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENTS INTO BIOETHANOL: A MINI REVIEW
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://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This paper discusses the A STEP INTO FUTURE FUEL INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENTS INTO BIOETHANOL: A MINI REVIEW. In my opinion, the paper needs lot revisions. Therefore, it is not accepted for publication.</p> <p>1. In the abstract section, the aim, the methodology of the study, and the quantitative values of the results should be presented. Please rewrite the abstract section.</p> <p>2. I think that there is some interesting aspect in this paper, but the overall presentation is very confuse.</p> <p>3. Quantify some of the main outcome in the conclusion.</p> <p>4. The main issue of this work is that the references are not up-to-date. The author needs to use the major references with the most recent work in this field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language fine. No issues detected</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebhi Redha
Department, University & Country	University of Medea, Algeria