



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_3797
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of COD:N Ratios and pH Control to Biogas Production from Vinasse

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript: "The Effect of COD:N Ratios and pH Control to Biogas Production from Vinasse" refers to the study of biogas production from vinasse under the influence of the relationship between (COD/N) and pH. The study is interesting from the perspective of sustainable energy source; however, the document structure is weak and must be reconstructed in more scientific manner. The language of the manuscript must be revised since it contains numerous of grammatical, spelling and editing mistakes.	Ok, we have checked. Please point out which part is still wrong. Thanks. .
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Considering that the ratio COD/N is the relevant factor is necessary to base the physicochemical criteria of this relationship to support this study. 2. The header "section 2.3.1." must indicate the conditions of the relationship COD/N and variation of pH, or this section, must be limited to the ratio of COD/N and add another section on the variation of pH. 3. Table 2 should be simple and clear. The initial pH value need not be repeated. The column concerning "pH treatment" is confusing. The title of Table 2 should be modified to indicate the condition of pH controlled and uncontrolled pH.	Ok, line 184-195 Sorry, in this experiment we focussed on effect of urea addition (COD:N) and pH control to biogas production, didn't focus on effect pH initial (may 7,8,9) to biogas production. So, pH was adjusted 7 for all variables. Ok, revised (line 101)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. The methodology to study the influence of pH controlled and uncontrolled pH is not accurate. 5. Line 172: In relation to Figure 2.c. The authors do not describe the appropriately behavior of the pH variation. 6. Authors should follow an ascending sequence in the number of figures. Figure 4 should correspond to Figure 3. 7. Figure 3. Authors should include the time at which recorded the data. 8. The conclusion is simple. It is necessary to highlight the results in relation to the working hypothesis.	Ok, revised Ok, revised (184-195 and 222-224) Ok, revised Ok, revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		