

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_119975
Title of the Manuscript:	ANAEROBIC CO-DIGESTION OF KITCHEN AND ANIMAL WASTES AT VARYING MIXING RATIOS
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript (MS) is important for new insight of kitchen and animal wastewater treatment. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract needs to be revised as follows: a) Please add the existing TSS, COD concentration and the standard; b) Please add the research aims. 4. The sub-section and structure is appropriate. 5. The MS is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English language quality is scholarly communicated. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>General comments for MS revisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract needs to be revised as follows: a) Please add the existing TSS, COD concentration and the standard; b) Please add the research aims. 2. The introduction should be included the background and novelty of this research. 3. The result and discussion should be conducted by comparing this research results to the previous research. 4. The conclusion should mention the important findings which are beneficial, also the limitation of this study. Therefore, the conclusion could suggest the further research which will be potentially developed. 	

[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:	Arlini Dyah Radityaningrum
Department, University & Country	Institut Teknologi Adhi Tama Surabaya, Indonesia