

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_120665
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF ECO-ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF HARVESTING GREENHOUSE GAS FROM BIO-WASTE: A CASE OF WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>Line 6: Abstract exceeding 300 words limit as per guidelines</p> <p>Line 14-15: Re-write the line. Also short form is not required for these common words.</p> <p>Line 20-21: Simply can be written as literature survey</p> <p>Line 37: HR stands for?</p> <p>Line 51: Before mentioning secondary data, mention first about primary data</p> <p>Line 62-65: There is confusion about primary and secondary data explanation. Align properly and rearrange the information.</p> <p>Line 68: remove</p> <p>Line 75-76: Mentioned reference is too old. Authors needs to mention latest reference for the waste water treatment process figure. It is easily available over the internet.</p> <p>Line 103-105: Hydrolysis step needs to be mentioned to complete the AD technology. Pls mention.</p> <p>Line 111-129: Pls mention reference for all these statements.</p> <p>Line 135: Avoid using capital letter in between sentences</p> <p>Line 157-162: Please explain the importance of writing this para. How it is related with experimental objectives? It should be a part of Introduction only.</p> <p>Line 176: Pls explain followings,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total feeding level (in meter) 2. Total Free height left for gas production? 3. Balloon capacity used. 4. How 30 days HRT is being suitable, explain. 5. Organic loading rate (OLR) 6. TS% of biowaste taken and of input feed <p>Line 441: Conflict of Interest section should be incorporated</p> <p>Apart from this, author need to work on sentence formatting and making it is a appealing one. Too much repetition and confusing lines are there.</p> <p>By correcting all mentioned details, manuscript may need another review.</p> <p>Thanks</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajesh Kumar Prasad
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India