

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_122266
Title of the Manuscript:	THE APPLICATION OF ANAEROBIC DIGESTION IN ADDRESSING THE UNSANITARY CONDITIONS OF LAVATORIES IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	Excellent choice of objective! There is a real shortage of available information on the present extent and future potential in the usage of biogas technology in North-Western Nigeria. The main value of the manuscript is that it addresses this shortage. The authors demonstrate the possible uses of biogas digestion in an area where this technology is currently underrepresented, although it has a huge development potential. More quantitative information could have been included. How-many tertiary institutions we are talking about, with approx. how many students and employees? Approx. how much waste needs to be treated, how much biogas and how much spent digestate can be expected, in what radius will it be economically available for farmers... etc.?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title appropriately summarizes the content of the article, although the target area could have been narrower	
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 suitable: sets the purpose of the manuscript, limits its scope and advances the most interesting conclusions	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is appropriate as is. Although I would probably have consecrated a separate subsection to a short quantitative overview of the present extent of biogas technology in the target area, an estimation of available raw materials for digestion, and - most importantly! - the future potential of the technology in the target area (North-Western Nigeria)	
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 correctly summarizes the basic biochemical principles of biogas digestion. The main technological choices are also listed, although I would have mentioned a few existing perspectives for further research and development, e.g electro-fermentation and the use of catalysers. A full subsection presents the locally relevant possible implementations. However, the review is limited to the small-scale digestion technologies, whereas industrial-scale implementations may also have relevance in the target area.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The reference list is somewhat shorter than expected for a mini-review. But it is relevant and sufficiently recent - even a little bit more recent than it should be, in this particular case. Information on biogas technology in the target region is so scarce that 15-20 years old references may be just as valuable as those from last year.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is correct and fully understandable.	
Optional/General comments	1) The thematic focus of this review is on the sanitation aspect of biogas digestion. However, that technology has 2 more, equally important roles: environmental protection and agriculture. I would suggest the authors to elaborate on those aspects, in a future article. 2) Science relies on data. Please try to gather as much quantitative information as you can!	

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