

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 Article

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? (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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>By addressing a gap or constraint in the current study, the article plays a crucial role in advancing the depth and breadth of scientific knowledge. Filling in these gaps is essential to the whole of knowledge in a given field.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Of course, the article's abstract is rather detailed. It gives a clear and short summary of the study's goals, methods, important discoveries, and conclusions, effectively encapsulating the entirety of the investigation.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript's overall structure and subsections are good.</p> <p>Yes, there is a high degree of scientific accuracy in the manuscript.</p> <p>Very less number of articles referred and not cited properly.</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, the English quality of the article are highly suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The reason for selecting the cassava peel powder and orange peel powder process should be justified. What was the size of the cassava peel powder and orange peel powder? Why 8% dry binder base 92% (cassava peel powder and orange peel powder) were chosen for any base reference paper related to it? Why not beyond 8% is to be included. Authors have to justify in the manuscript. That will enhance the quality of the manuscript. In the Section 3.2.1. It mentioned Fin 8. i) and below the image a) Change it accordingly What is the reason carbonization time is higher for manioc when compared with orange? After the combustion of biofuels? how much quantity of Ash is produced from the different biofuels? Can you add thermal properties of biofuels like Calorific Value, Flash Point, Fire point and so? How much heat does biofuels release Could you clarify the reason Why you can't check the smoke level.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sabarish Rajagopalan
Department, University & Country	Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, India