



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_51062
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy Potential Study of Some Tropical Wood Species from Nigeria
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) In most part of the world, trees from reserve forest/protected forest is not allowed to harvest. Therefore in introduction chapter, the author can include, whether the logs/trees in Nigeria is harvested from Tree outside forest (Farm Plantations) or trees from reserve forest/protected forest.</p> <p>2) In manuscript, the botanical name of all the tropical species were presented in normal without italics, as per the norms, all the botanical names should be written in Italics. Therefore, all the botanical names in manuscript should be written in Italics.</p> <p>3) Water equivalent ratio and dry matter production is must for calculating the energy production in tree species. Therefore, author can include these two parameters in identifying the energy potential of tropical tree species also.</p> <p>4) The age of the 10 tropical species (Sawdust), which is used for energy potential study should be included in Materials and Methods chapter. It is must that, all the 10 tree species should be in same age-class, because, the properties will differ from age to age.</p> <p>5) The methodology for calculating the wood density is not given in Materials and Methods, therefore, it can be included.</p> <p>6) In Introduction chapter, the end use (Value added material) for 10 tropical trees species used in the study may be included.</p> <p>7) Relate the interaction between energy parameters (Calorific value & Ash %) with ultimate analysis (Carbon, Nitrogen, Sulphur, Hydrogen and Oxygen) used in the study.</p> <p>8) Include the experimental design used for calculating the fixed carbon, volatile matter, moisture content and ash as you have mentioned standard deviation in tables.</p> <p>9) Saw mill dust contain both the sapwood dust and heartwood dust, therefore, analysis is needed to find out the relativity probability of species.</p> <p>10) In result and discussion chapter, the reference study the author highlighted for density, calorific value and energy content is only noted with author alone. Whereas, the species in which they have studied is not included, therefore it is needed to be added with species in what they studied (Eg. Huhtinen, 27 & Akhator et al., 14).</p> <p>11) In conclusion chapter, the manuscript is highlighted with only maximum energy content species, whereas, the species with minimum energy content can also be included.</p>	<p>1) Agreed. This has been included. The trees are obtained forest reserves approved and developed by the government for harvest purpose.</p> <p>2) Agreed. This has been corrected.</p> <p>3) This study was limited to analysis on dry mass basis.</p> <p>4) Agreed. This has been included.</p> <p>5) The wood density was not calculated but taken from Carsan <i>et al.</i> [29].</p> <p>6) Agreed. This has been included.</p> <p>7) This interaction of these properties is aptly captured in equation (11).</p> <p>8) Agreed. This has been included as well as the respective references for the experimental procedures.</p> <p>9) The relativity probability study of the species is not within the scope of this analysis.</p> <p>10) Agreed. This has been included in the brief literature review under the introduction section (Akinola and Fapetu [13], Akhator et al. [14]) and in the result section (Huhtinen [27]).</p> <p>11) Agreed. This has been included.</p>
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	