

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_111992
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy recovery from agri-food processing waste using a thermal process : Formulation and characterization of biofuels from Citrus sinensis and Manihot esculenta peelings
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>No, this is a very important point: the references are not at all current.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? <p>Yes</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>"Indeed, in sub-Saharan Africa, traditional energies, most notably wood, are the most widely used in heat production, as around 792 million people used traditional biomass for cooking in 2014 [16]." A reference to 2014 is unacceptable in a paper that will be published in 2024... Besides, why only sub-Saharan Africa? Bring real GLOBAL data, to show the importance of your work. I understand that the paper focuses on this area, but it is not made explicit at any point in the introduction. I suggest starting with global data, then the continent and finally the country.</p> <p>"In 2002, wood energy, along with charcoal, formed almost 90-97% of household energy consumption [3,4]". 2002??? The same comment I made earlier applies to this. Would you trust data showing the efficacy of a vaccine tested in 2002, for example? And today? These data have certainly changed a lot.</p> <p>"In rural areas, almost all the energy consumed for cooking comes from biomass" almost all ? how much ? we're talking about an area of exact sciences, there must be data to back this up.</p> <p>"The excessive use of wood undoubtedly leads to a reduction in vegetation cover, the advance of the desert, and a weakening of the environment." This is not true, since the volume of wood production is very large. In itself, wood and its derivatives are the best biomass available. You could argue that it's in our best interest to have alternatives, such as the bark waste you mentioned. But to be honest, from a biorefinery point of view your work loses a lot, since there are countless studies focussing on developing products with very high added value with these "residues" that you use here.</p> <p>In general, the introduction is very poorly written, brings up old data and points to theories that don't make sense. My suggestion is that the introduction be reworked with current data and consistent statements, and I also recommend that the authors read more current papers and books in the field.</p> <p>M&M</p> <p>The methodology presents the same problem, data from 2016, 2017... 2019 at the latest, i.e. 4</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>years ago, and we know that a country can change a lot in 4 years. Figure 1 is of very poor quality.</p> <p>There are formatting errors in the caption of the figures.</p> <p>Figure 2 is unnecessary. As are 3, 4 and 5. I suggest removing them.</p> <p>Many formatting errors in Table 1: rate of 1.1%. This rate will be applied in the present study. The amortization period is set at seven (7) years in the present study.</p> <p>☒ Table 1. Capital and operating costs of the biofuel production plant</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>Quantity</th> <th>Cost per unit (€)</th> <th>Total cost (€)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4">1. Investment costs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carbonizer</td> <td>5</td> <td>1524</td> <td>7620</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manual press</td> <td>2</td> <td>305</td> <td>610</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The source of the equations is different from the rest of the text.</p> <p>In short, there are so many errors to a certain extent that I have no option but to suggest that the work be rejected in its current form. Well, the only innovation in the theme is the location of the study, and this is barely touched on at all. However, I suggest that the authors, after the paper has been rejected, rework and reformat the text and submit it again.</p>	Section	Quantity	Cost per unit (€)	Total cost (€)	1. Investment costs				Carbonizer	5	1524	7620	Manual press	2	305	610	
Section	Quantity	Cost per unit (€)	Total cost (€)															
1. Investment costs																		
Carbonizer	5	1524	7620															
Manual press	2	305	610															

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrey Pereira Acosta
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Paraná, Brazil