



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_50398
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy efficiency "Example of Adana Yüreğir wastewater treatment plant"
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>1. A good effort on " energy efficiency assessment for WWT " by the authors for identifying generation & utilizing bio-solids to produce electricity which will considerable reduce the carbon footprint.</p> <p>2. I have slightly modified the study theme which should be considered by the author(s)</p> <p>2. Abstract is too short and inconclusive, which should be made to apprehend complete overview of the study</p> <p>3. The standard research format has not been followed , the same has been corrected (please see the attached marked manuscript)</p> <p>4. Comprehensive introduction has been added , but at the same time no literature review on the subject has been added which should now be incorporated . (please see my remarks on the attached marked manuscript in track change format)</p> <p>5. Clearly defined study objectives have not been included which should now be included to make the paper more clear and understandable for the readers .</p> <p>6. No clear materials and methodology , which has been mixed up with results and discussion. The same has been segregated (please see my remarks on the attached manuscript)</p> <p>7. No processes flow diagrams of WWT and bio-gas generation has been included, the same be included.</p> <p>8. Conclusion and recommendations have been mixed up . A precise set of recommendations be given under separte heading , as indicated on attached manuscript .</p> <p>9.The paragraph numbering was not used which have now been added on the attached manuscript (track change format)</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	All addition and deletions have been shown on the attached manuscript as track change format . The deletions and additions have been highlighted with red & blue colours respectively	
Optional/General comments	These are OK, Preferably , reference sitting should be on the line of APA format. DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs should be added	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Islam-ul-Haque
Department, University & Country	Pakistan