



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_38559
Title of the Manuscript:	ENERGY EVALUATION AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF BIOGAS PRODUCED FROM CO-DIGESTING KITCHEN WASTE AND COW DUNG
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>This manuscript is well written to the highest esteem. Enough literatures were cited to support the research with adequate illustrations. Below are the few areas that need to be review</p> <p>The Abstract need to be review and reframe. Most of the sentences used were not well constructed. Also some words need not to be there.</p> <p>In your discussion, there need to state the reasons for the variation in TS, VS etc. for both the cow dung and the kitchen waste. Also what make the biogas produced from kitchen waste more than that produce from cow dung.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract rephrased - Elaboration made on TS and VS - Clarification done on why KW produces more biogas
Minor REVISION comments	<p>8. The key words needs to be in alphabetical order 19-20. Remove the numbering and replace by comma 60. were then taken through the evaluation of the total solid (TS). were then taken to evaluate the total solid (TS) 71-73. The 21 set ups were assessed in three different conditions. Seven were in the pure state, seven were..... the sentence is too long</p> <p>76. Chromatograph machine.....should be chromatography machine</p> <p>113-114. S_{6a} was pure cow dung, S_{6b} clean water and S_{6c} was cow dung in a basic environment. With clean water</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8. Key word rearranged - 19 – 20 numbers replaced by commas - 60 sentence rephrased - 71 – 73 formatting done - 76. Spelling corrected - 113 – 114 explanation given
Optional/General comments		