

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130672
Title of the Manuscript:	Algae Biofilm Produced from Anaerobic Digester Wastewater Demonstrated as Biofertilizer for Dwarf Wheat
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Circular economy requires that there be a closed loop between waste generation and disposal, as such innovative ways of diverting and reusing waste are necessary. This work does exactly that thereby contributing meaningfully to the scientific community. I am of the view that as this work stands it is original and therefore adds new insight or joins the conversation around reuse or repurposing of biomass to reduce waste that ends up in landfill sites.	Yes, the authors agree that this research demonstrates a closed loop economy example by upscaling the value of waste generation with the production of an bioproduct with positive economic value.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The tittle is suitable for the article.	The authors agree that the title is suitable for the goals and testing described in the manuscript.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and sums up all the key processes followed during the research including the key findings.	The authors agree that the abstract is comprehensive and addresses the key findings from the testing and research. The authors have added the topic of struvite precipitation and have simplified the statistics results for readability as recommended by the other peer reviewer.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	For a short communication, the article is scientifically correct.	The authors agree that the article is correct and concise for a short communication.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are up to date and very recent as such there are no identifiable issues with them and they are relevant to the content covered in the study.	The authors agrees with the statement on references, and we have added a reference in response to the other peer reviewer on the broader implications of using biofertilizers in large-scale agriculture.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language used is suitable for a scholarly communication.	The authors agree.
Optional/General comments	The authors need to double check the spelling of some words, eg in Table 1, yield is presented as Tield . A space is needed in this line “The RABR isan outdoor” in the first paragraph on the second page.	The authors have made the correction for Yield in Table 1. The authors have made the correction to read “The RABR is an outdoor” The authors have double checked the spelling of words.

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	The authors have no ethics issues within or about the manuscript.