

Review of: "Recycling of Waste Bamboo (*Bambusa vulgaris*) into Value-Added Platform Chemicals: Bioethanol and Bioethylene"

Joseph Ogunjobi¹

¹ Federal University of Technology, Akure

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present study is very interesting as it valorises waste to deliver important biobased chemicals for the industry. This is key to ensuring a sustainable, low-carbon footprint economy. However, authors should address the following to improve this publication.

1. The abstract is just an overview of the experiments done. There is presently no interesting information the abstract provides about the results achieved in this study. This should be addressed.
2. The present introduction is not in conformity with scientific journal standards. While it explains some terminologies, it has not clearly stated the problems, motivation, and novelty of the present study. Again, this is not a thesis or dissertation, so the separate section on literature review and other terms explained should all subsume into the introduction.
3. Please confirm which of these is correct: "800ml of bio-ethanol was produced from 2kg of bamboo" and "Bio-ethanol produced was 65% of the bamboo mass (2kg)," as I am not sure 800 ml/2 000 g (v/w) is up to 65%. The same goes for the bioethylene yield.
4. Therefore, a formula or equation referring to yield calculation must be provided.
5. Following this statement, "Bio-ethanol has a slightly higher flash pointThe purification and refining processes involved in conventional ethanol production tend to yield a lower flash point compared to that of bio-ethanol," it will be useful to add a statement such as "the obtained bioethanol is not in its pure form such as to be used for commercial or analytical purposes unless purified.
6. Also, analytical characterisation, e.g., infrared at least, should be done on the products to substantiate their conformity with standards.
7. Experimental results should be reported in triplicates to ensure reproducibility of the study.
8. Authors should discuss their results better and compare them with previous studies.