



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JENRR_50479</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Circular Light Bulb Economy: Framework for Sustainable End-of-Life Management of Modern Light Bulb</b>
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Abstract</b> <b>2. Introduction</b> <b>3. Methodology</b> <b>4. Findings</b> <b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>1. The abstract is carefully presented by the author, but a brief on background information is missing in the abstract.</b>  <b>2. Author should present the rationale, significance/marginal contributions, key objective and organization of the paper in the last paragraph of the Introduction part.</b>  <b>3. Although author state the method used in the abstract and also show some summary tables on the outcome, author need to show clearly the process involved in the pilot testing (population and sampling technique) and their justifications based empirical evidences.</b>  <b>4. Key findings in the abstract are different from what the author presented in the findings and discussion part. The arguments put forth by the author in the abstract does not reflect directly what is obtained in the main section of the finding. So, author should revisit and align the deviations.</b>  <b>5. In the conclusion part, author need to compliment it with the main implications of the findings and some suggestions/recommendations.</b>	According to reviewers comments the paper has been modified and corrected.
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Tables</b> <b>2. Title</b>	<b>1. While presenting the summary of results, author should resort to academic tables to improve the quality and layout of the paper. The tables used by the author are not professional/academic.</b>  <b>2. Author may consider revisiting the title of the paper and make slight changes to attract the attention of the readers and also to capture the key variables of interest in the paper</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>On the whole, the author did well in presenting the issue step by step and also exhibit a background knowledge of the study area.</b>	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	