Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_77449**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Biogas Production from Brewery Waste: A Case Study for Tanzania Breweries Company Limited (Arusha-Branch)**
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:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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 1. The following questions need to be answered: i. What was the size of the CARMATEC biogas digester? ii. Which thermometer was used to measure digester temperature and ambient temperature? iii. Why was a CARMATEC digester used in this research, or why choose CARMATEC digesters rather than other fixed biogas digesters? iv. How many digesters were used in this study? v. What was the loading rate? vi. What were the TS and VS of the input substrate? vii. What was the mixing ratio of Biomass to Water? viii. Which flow meter was used to measure biogas production? ix. What was the composition of carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulphide in the biogas? x. What was the methane quality? xi. What new knowledge was generated? 2. A photo of the CARMATEC digester is required. 3. The literature given is too general. The literature on biogas production from brewery waste is required. Many papers have been published on biogas production from brewery waste. The literature on CARMATEC biogas digesters is needed. 4. A detailed procedure is needed. 5. Section 3.1 and 3.2 should go to the methodology section. 6. Description of the study area is required. 7. Avoid using the word gas instead of biogas. 8. There is no consistency. Stick to biogas digester than biogas plant or avoid using them both in this research.	1. The following questions need to be answered: i. What was the size of the CARMATEC biogas digester? ii. Which thermometer was used to measure digester temperature and ambient temperature? iii. Why was a CARMATEC digester used in this research, or why choose CARMATEC digesters rather than other fixed biogas digesters? iv. How many digesters were used in this study? v. What was the loading rate? vi. What were the TS and VS of the input substrate? vii. What was the mixing ratio of Biomass to Water? viii. Which flow meter was used to measure biogas production? ix. What was the composition of carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulphide in the biogas? x. What was the methane quality? xi. What new knowledge was generated? 2. A photo of the CARMATEC digester is required. 3. The literature given is too general. The literature on biogas production from brewery waste is required. Many papers have been published on biogas production from brewery waste. The literature on CARMATEC biogas digesters is needed. 4. A detailed procedure is needed. 5. Section 3.1 and 3.2 should go to the methodology section. 6. Description of the study area is required. 7. Avoid using the word gas instead of biogas. 8. There is no consistency. Stick to biogas digester than biogas plant or avoid using them both in this research. 9. The paper needs to be sent to an English editor. Past tense and present tense are mixed. There are also spelling mistakes. For example, check the heading for Fig. 3.	

9. The paper needs to be sent to an English editor. Past tense and present tense are mixed. There are also spelling mistakes. For example, check the heading for Fig. 3. 10. The results are not discussed. 11. The graphs are not analysed. 12. The novelty of the research is silent. 13. The conclusion is very shallow. It should summarise the results.	10. The results are not discussed. 11. The graphs are not analysed. 12. The novelty of the research is silent. 13. The conclusion is very shallow. It should summarise the results.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	All the comments made should be addressed.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Patrick Mukumba**
Department, University & Country	**University of Fort Hare, South Africa**