

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_88900
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of biofuels as an alternative source to petroleum
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalajb2t.com/index.php/AJB2T/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Biofuels are strong alternatives to fossil based and a reliable tool to decarbonize the global economy. Therefore studies on bioenergy are essential and gaining continuous traction, this makes the present study of great relevance to industry experts and policymakers.</p> <p>In the present study, the authors attempted to concisely review the production factors in biofuel production. Relevant feedstock, production technologies and the environmental/economic factors were discussed. The manuscript is well written and I therefore recommend it for publication after the following concerns are addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors should stick to one style of referencing either numeric, APA or MLA in text citation. 2. The Introduction part must be improved by including new relevant literature about the production of trend of biofuel across the globe, regions or nations. I suggest the use of similar studies as references (for example, please see and discuss: https://doi.org/10.9734/JENRR/2019/v3i330100) 3. Authors should show the graphical mechanisms involved in a typical transesterification process. 4. Table 2 should be reformatted, double numbering is redundant. The first number is adequate. 5. In the Table 2, No. 2 and 7 are the same for the advantages, authors should expunge one. The No 3. is not true, presently biofuels in the same quality as fossil fuel are much expensive. Authors should check this link to read more on the economical implications of biofuels here 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Adefarati Oloruntoba
Department, University & Country	China University of Petroleum Beijing, China