

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JENRR_114427</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Parametric Evaluation of Biogas Production from Saw Dust and Treated Human Faeces: Optimal (Custom) Design Approach</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dear Editor, I went through the paper entitled "Parametric Evaluation of Biogas Production from Saw Dust and Treated Human Faeces: Optimal (Custom) Design Approach". The article is written in a scientific manner but should be improved based to the following comments. Paper can be accepted for publication after minor revision.</li> <li>The title is suitable but the word "Customer" in parenthesis should removed.</li> <li>The abstract is comprehensive but it's first is similar to the first paragraph of the introduction.</li> <li>Subsections and structure are appropriate.</li> <li>The subject is not new but the article is scientifically valuable.</li> <li>The references are sufficient and most of them are recent (2020-2024).</li> <li>Figures should be improved to be clear and improve their visibility.</li> <li>The sentences highlighted in yellow should be separated.</li> <li>Authors only used R<sup>2</sup> and r as statistical metrics to evaluate the performances. I think that other statistical metrics such as RMSE, MAE, and MAPE can be used for comparison of performances.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Deogratias Nurwaha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Burundi, Burundi</b>