



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Energy Recovery from Ulva sp. Algal Biomass in the Form of Fuel Briquettes: The Influence of the Binder on Energy and Mechanical Performance”

Submitted: 23 March 2026

Accepted: 12 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Kalidou Ba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n24p33

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Salloom A. Al-Juboori
Applied Science Private University, Jordan

Reviewer 2: Ranojit Kumar Dutta
City University, Faculty of Science and Engineering, GED, Khagan, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title conveys the general theme of the study; however, it lacks precision and does not fully capture the scope or specific focus of the research. Refinement is recommended to improve clarity and informativeness.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract provides a broad overview of the study but does not sufficiently present essential elements, particularly the methodology and concrete results. It should be rewritten to clearly summarize the objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and stylistic inconsistencies. These issues reduce readability and occasionally obscure meaning. Comprehensive language revision is required to meet academic writing standards.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods section is inadequately detailed. Key information regarding research design, sampling procedures, data collection tools, and analytical techniques is either missing or insufficiently explained. Clarification and expansion are necessary to ensure rigor and reproducibility.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are presented but need clearer organization and more explicit explanation. In several instances, findings are not adequately interpreted or connected to the research questions. Improvements in clarity and analytical depth are recommended.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

While the conclusion summarizes the study, some statements appear generalized or not fully supported by the presented results. The section should be revised to align closely with the findings and avoid introducing unsupported claims.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is relevant but could be strengthened through the inclusion of more recent and authoritative sources. Minor inconsistencies in formatting should be corrected according to ESJ guidelines.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript demonstrates academic potential; however, substantial revisions are required before it can be

reconsidered. The authors are advised to:

- Improve the precision and clarity of the title and abstract.
- Strengthen the methodology section with detailed and transparent descriptions.
- Enhance the presentation and interpretation of results.
- Revise the conclusion so that it is strictly supported by the data.
- Undertake thorough language editing throughout the manuscript.
- Update and properly format references in line with ESJ standards.

Addressing the above points will significantly improve the manuscript's quality and suitability for publication.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and appropriately reflects the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract is well-structured and effectively communicates the study's objectives, methodology, principal results, and conclusions. It provides sufficient quantitative detail (e.g., LHV and combustion time) and includes statistical validation, enhancing its scientific rigor and clarity.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The manuscript includes a number of grammatical and typographical errors. A thorough language revision is recommended to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall readability.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods used in the study are clearly explained and well-structured.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are clearly presented and appear to be free from significant errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is well-founded and appropriately supported by the results and analysis provided.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive, relevant, and appropriate to the scope of the study.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript presents a relevant and timely study on the production of algae-based briquettes as a sustainable alternative to conventional fuels. The objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions are generally well-structured and clearly presented. The experimental design, including the variation of binder composition and evaluation of physicochemical and combustion properties, is appropriate and scientifically sound. The findings, particularly the superior performance of the BAL20 formulation, are clearly discussed and supported by the data.

However, the manuscript would benefit from careful proofreading to correct grammatical and typographical errors and improve overall readability. Additionally, the discussion section could be strengthened by comparing the results more explicitly with existing literature. Providing more detail on the environmental and economic implications of large-scale application would also enhance the study's impact. Overall, this is a valuable contribution, and with minor revisions, it will be suitable for publication.
