

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_85288
Title of the Manuscript:	An experimental case study on generation of Bio-energy as clean technology initiative in a Food Industry
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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		N/A
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Some grammar errors, please see them highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.</li><li><b>ABSTRACT</b></li><li>ii. <i>Ministry is encouraging clean technologies...</i> which ministry? Any name to be specific</li><li>iii. <i>Together with Pyrolysis, AD can be used for efficient BE generation...</i>Pyrolysis was not used in this study with AD, I suggest that this sentence should be removed.</li><li>iv. .... of the entire industrial set-up. This is lab-based experiment. It is not an industrial set-up. I suggest that this sentence be rephrased.</li><li>v. 16L/Kg methane..... it is difficult to confirm this yield is produced in this lab-based experiment.</li><li><b>MATERIALS and METHOD</b></li><li>vi. Authors did not specify the quantity of potato used. The set up described in Fig. 4 is a lab demonstration and should not be misconstrued for an industrial set up.</li><li>vii. It is difficult to get a high volume of gas shown in Fig. 5 from the set up shown in Fig. 4</li><li><b>CONCLUSION</b></li><li>viii. Authors did not provide conclusion. Authors are advised to include this.</li><li>ix. REFERENCE</li><li>x. Reference 12 is incomplete</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Grammatical errors are corrected in the highlighted sections in the manuscript.</li><li>ii. The ministry referred here is Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Government of India which is now mentioned.</li><li>iii. The sentence is removed.</li><li>iv. The experimental set-up moved up to industrial one. The photographs are given in figure 5.</li><li>v. The amount of methane mentioned is generated in industrial set-up. The value is given for accumulated gas for 15 days of AD.</li><li>vi. Firstly the pre-treatment is done in the lab then repeated in industrial set up.</li><li>vii. A new figure is added giving the parts of industrial set-up where the gas was generated and now is labelled as figure 5. Previously numbered figure 5 is now changed to figure 6.</li><li>viii. Conclusion section is added.</li><li>ix. The correction required is made.</li><li>x. The reference mentioned is completed.</li></ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Authors need to address the above issues	N/A

### **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>	N/A