

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
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.	The Manuscript' results did not show any significant findings. It did not prove that rice straw could be used for the production of briquettes. The proximate values obtained for each parameter were not shown.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 was not comprehensive The abstract does not indicate the results of the research; it should show key findings indicating the obtained values in each parameter. For example; state the values obtained from the experiment such as Moisture content, ash content, calorific values, fixed carbon content etc. that the rice straw briquettes have. The abstract should also indicate the sampling method used, and the ratio of rice straw to the binding material.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	No, the manuscript is not scientifically robust The author did not state the results achieved briquettes on the following parameters 1. Durability 2. Hardness 3. Calorific value 4. Ash content 5. Volatile matter 6. Fixed carbon 7. Moisture content The results did not show any significant findings and did not prove that rice straw can be has good parameters for the production of briquettes. The proximate values obtained for each parameter are not shown.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but only that The author should cite the source of the following statement “For rice briquettes the density usually ranges from 1,000 to 1,200kg/m ³ .”	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	Yes, but need little grammar check	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript did not show much scientific proves that the briquettes produced from the rice straw are good source of energy. The method should indicate the mixing ratio used to make the briquettes. The author should indicate the temperature at which the rice straw was dried The author should clearly state the binding materials used for the production of the briquettes and justify why he/she chose them. He/she should also state the duration the briquettes were held in compression in the briquetting machine and at what pressure. Fig 3, should be introduced stating its purpose The author should indicate the software used for the factorial randomized design. State the statistical software, which was used for the analysis and the version.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paul Victor Jatta
Department, University & Country	The Gambia University Of Applied Science, Engineering And Technology (USET), The Gambia