



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_51133
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling Carbon Emissions Efficiency from UK Higher Education Institutions Using Data Envelopment Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Section 1.1: Consider revising "In England, the yearly costs for energy....." I suggest it reads the The yearly cost of energy.....</p> <p>Consider merging some paragraphs that are small. For instance, the first paragraph in section 1.2 containing the definition of energy efficiency.</p> <p>Delete the provision for reference number 34 in the reference listing.</p> <p>There are two section 1.2. Data Envelopment and Malmquist index in Energy efficiency modelling should read 1.3.</p> <p>Proof read the entire work and label sections correctly.</p> <p>Clearly state the research gap your study fills in the supposed section 1.3. You further went ahead to state "This study will therefore fill the gap by utilizing....." Without stating the gap.</p>	<p>Thank you for the eagle eyes review. I have identified and corrected the erros flagged.</p> <p>The suggestions are also apt and have been effected.</p>
Optional/General comments	The research work is well written.	Thank you.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	All authors hereby declare that all analysis have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 declaration of Helsinki.