

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124887
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF METHANE YIELD FROM CONTINUOUS AND BATCH FERMENTATIVE PROCESSING OF SELECTED AGROWASTE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into optimizing biogas production, a key area in sustainable energy research. By comparing batch and continuous processes, it highlights the potential of co-digestion and steady-state operations for maximizing methane yield, which is crucial for scaling up bioenergy production. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical approach to solving energy challenges, though more detailed exploration of the underlying microbial mechanisms could further enrich its contributions.	
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.	It is appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, apart from the introduction part. Author should provide clear objectives by the end of the section.	
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 sound, using established methodologies for substrate treatment, gas analysis, and methane yield measurement. It demonstrates rigor through statistical analysis and references to relevant literature, enhancing its credibility. The inclusion of both batch and continuous processes, along with co-digestion, adds depth to the findings, making the study technically reliable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author can add more papers as reference.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes with minor corrections marked in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Edits marked in the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

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:	Imran Hussain Mahdy
Department, University & Country	University of Idaho, USA