

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_125115
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Briquetting Process Parameters for Rice Straw Biofuels
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

#### 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an important topic in the context of sustainable energy production. The research on optimizing briquetting processes for rice straw biofuels has significant potential to reduce agricultural waste, create renewable energy sources, and mitigate environmental issues. The study's experimental approach provides practical insights into the densification process, contributing to the advancement of biofuel technologies. I appreciate the thorough analysis of process parameters and statistical treatment to identify optimal conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and reflects the core content of the manuscript. No changes are necessary.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but would benefit from more specificity regarding the range of process parameters tested. Including quantitative data (e.g., optimal values for pressure, temperature, and moisture content) would strengthen the summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections that follow a logical progression. However, the Materials and Methods section could be slightly condensed for clarity, especially where there is repetition of certain details about the experimental setup.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust. The authors have employed well-established methods such as ANOVA and factorial regression for data analysis, and the results are well-supported by statistical evidence. The findings are both technically sound and practically applicable, particularly in the context of biofuel production and agricultural waste management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and up-to-date, citing key studies in the field. There are no immediate recommendations for additional references.	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality is generally acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are a few grammatical and syntactical errors throughout the manuscript that could be improved for better readability and clarity. Some sentences are too long or lack proper punctuation, making them difficult to follow. It is recommended that the authors perform a thorough language revision to enhance clarity, coherence, and precision in their writing.</p> <p><b>Minor Examples:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the abstract, "By systematically varying key parameters such as pressure temperature and moisture content" should have a comma between "pressure" and "temperature."</li><li>• Some sections in the introduction can benefit from rephrasing for conciseness and flow, particularly where there are repetitive phrases regarding rice straw and its usage.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study is technically sound, and the methodology is well-documented. The topic is relevant and addresses a pressing issue in biofuel production and agricultural waste management. Further details on the economic feasibility of the process, as briefly mentioned in the discussion, could provide valuable insights for industrial-scale applications. Additionally, the conclusion could be expanded to emphasize the broader implications of the research in terms of policy, scalability, and environmental benefits.</p> <p>The manuscript is of high quality, but minor revisions related to language and some additional insights would improve its clarity and impact.</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>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Deepak Bornare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maharashtra Institute of Technology, India</b>