



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Anaerobic digestion is an effective method for organic pollution reduction and bioenergy production and has increasing applications worldwide. The produced biogas consists of 50–70 % CH ₄ and 30–50 % CO ₂ . The most common utilization route of biogas is for electricity production, often combined with utilization of the excess heat. This widens up the opportunities to utilize biogas in distant energy consumption locations. The most common methods for biogas upgrading include water washing, pressure swing adsorption, polyglycol adsorption, and chemical treatment, which are performed outside the anaerobic reactor and require investments in external compressors, pumps, membranes, etc. Therefore, the cost for biogas upgrading is relatively high. In situ biogas upgrading has been investigated previously and several methods have been proposed, where CH ₄ rich biogas could be obtained directly from the anaerobic reactor. In this article was investigated the energy evaluation and qualitative analysis of biogas produced from co-digesting from kitchen waste and cow dung. The article presents a small number of references (introduction) and the discussion of the results is poor. The paper is not organized. The manuscript requires a language revision (English). The text is difficult to understand.	- Abstract rephrased Additions have been made to improve the paper
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		-
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		-