

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_86270
Title of the Manuscript:	Solid Fuel Production from Animal Manure
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Numbers should be subscripted in CO₂, SO₂ 2. Grammar and punctuation errors should be corrected throughout the manuscript. 3. The introduction is too long and non-focus. The manuscript is on biofuel. Authors should exclude voluminous discussion on solar energy, wind energy, hydropower because they are not related to the main objectives of the manuscript. Authors could limit their discussion to traditional energy resources and biofuel. 4. Biopower and bioenergy as discussed in this manuscript are semantical i.e. are the same and could be merged together. 5. The figures should be renamed according to journal format not according to thesis writing. The figures should be serial e.g. Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3, .Fig. 15, regardless of their section or sub-section of appearance. 6. The Table 3, Table 5, Table 7, Table 9, and Table 11, all have the same title (i.e. Results of analysis). Also, The Table 2, Table 4, Table 6, Table 8, and Table 10, all have the same title (i.e. Solid fuel analysis report). This needs to be renamed. Every table must have its own unique name. e.g. Table 2 Solid fuel analysis of chicken dung, Table 3 Energy and proximate analysis of chicken dung, Table 4 Solid fuel analysis of Sheep dung...etc 7. The tables under the statistical analysis do not have numbers. These should be corrected too. 8. Many of the figures are without titles. Authors should correct it. 9. The results and discussion are not scientific enough, outlining the results do not provide good understanding of the results reported. Authors should discuss the results critically, not as bullet points. 10. The conclusion should be rewritten, results should not just be lumped as conclusion. Authors should concisely provide their main findings in the conclusion and the reason for the differences in the energy density in the different animal dungs. Authors should also provide limitations to their study and a general recommendation for future studies. 11. Some references are non-english, authors should translate the references to English since the readership will be English based. 	
Optional/General comments	Its an extensive and informative study	

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