Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_86010**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Possibility of Biogas Production from Anaerobic Co-digestion of Hemp – A perspective in Germany**
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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	The research topic is incomplete. It is co-digestion of Hemp with what? The abstract is inadequate. The aim and objectives are not mentioned in the abstract. In addition, the procedure for the research was silent in the abstract. The introduction section was inadequate. The researcher did not have a full grasp of this research. The research title is not correlated to the introduction. The methodology section was not well articulated. Some results of the study were put under the methodology section. Equations for finding total solids, volatile solids and ash content are missing. These results are not detailed are not discussed. Compare the your results with other research findings on biogas technology. Many questions come from this research as follows: • What was the pH of the slurry? • At what operating temperature was the optimum biogas produced? • What was the mixing ratios of the co-substrates? • What was the methane content of the maximum biogas produced? • What was the loading rate? • Why drawing cumulative graphs? • What was the best mixing ratio of the co-substrates? • How many experimental set ups? The results are inadequate and not convincing at all. The research is not detailed and lacked relevant information of the study. Many comments are highlighted on the attached paper. **The conclusion is inadequate and should be revised.** Many comments are highlighted on the attached paper. Therefore, major revision is required for the paper to be worth publishing.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Major corrections are required for the paper to be worth publishing.	

Review Form 1.6

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**