

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126234
Title of the Manuscript:	An overview on prospects of Organic waste: The promising Fuel of future
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Organic waste treatment is an extremely diverse topic with enormous past experiences, and ever growing scientific research, as well as technological development. This increased interest justifies periodic reviews, presenting the state of the art, and future prospects. The authors intended to narrow down this vast diversity by focusing to the energetic use, which is a reasonable choice. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title defines the original objective of the manuscript to focus on the utilization of organic wastes as fuel. In reality, only less than half of the presented methods deal with the energetic use, the majority involves material uses (such as compost, secondary chemicals etc.) <i>Please either refocus the title or reorganize the contents of the paper!</i>	
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 correctly resumes the expected content of the manuscript. Meanwhile, the importance and the purpose of the paper is not defined. <i>Please complete the abstract!</i>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The basic structure is logical, but the subsections of Section 4. show some inconsistencies. For example 4.2. does not even mention the base product of anaerobic digestion: the biogas. It is barely listed at another place: 4.8 Energy from waste. Composting fills a whole subsection (4.3.), whereas it essentially belongs to another subsection: 4.10 Microbial treatment of lignocellulosic waste. In Figure 4, the use of fly larvae and vermicomposting are labelled as "New approach", although both have been known and used for half a century or more, as shown by the related references. <i>Please rearrange!</i>	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The numeration of 4.9. subtitles is wrong, they belong to 4.8. Energy from waste. - The manuscript gives a fair overview of the past trends in organic waste treatment, but it fails to include the recent approaches both on the scientific research side and the technological development implications. Bio-electrochemical systems, constructed wetlands, photofermentation and electrofermentation could have deserved a subsection, for instance. <i>Please complete!</i> - In general, the reviewed methods are correctly presented. However, a few factual errors occur in the manuscript. 4.3.: a large variety of controlled composting processes are used in industrial compost facilities. 4.9.1.1 Biohydrogen dark fermentation has long grown out from the laboratory, several thousand industrial installations operate only in Europe. <i>Please correct!</i> 6. Conclusion is not a conclusion drawn from the findings of this particular review. The section contains general principles that are anyway obvious without this manuscript. At the same time, a few sentences about the most perspective up-coming fields of research would not hurt. <i>Please reconsider!</i> 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The number of references is sufficient, but it is largely outdated: only 22 out of 95 references are more recent than 6 years. Citing half-century old historical data can give an interesting colour when demonstrating the temporal development of a scientific field. But they are inappropriate for reviewing the present state of art and its future prospects. Both factual errors mentioned in the previous section occurred because of outdated information.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is appropriate and intelligible.	
Optional/General comments	<i>I recommend the manuscript for publication after revision, according to the above suggestions.</i>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabor Z. Szelenyi
Department, University & Country	University of Pannonia, Hungary