



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_49896
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetics Properties and Thermal Behavior of Pine Sawdust and Municipal Solid Waste
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>)

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	The abstract is weak, in the first paragraph the authors introduce the idea of the research then jumped to the results. I recommend to rewrite the abstract properly. The materials and methods is not well written and not organized properly -The conclusion is very weak, it is only describing in general the findings of the study. Authors should include a stronger conclusion to represent the depth of the analysis of the results conducted in this study. -the authors did not show or describe any potential applications for this source of energy	Improved and addressed all recommendations
Minor REVISION comments	Although the mathematical analysis was described well, the experimental is very poor. The authors did not include any figures or plots for the apparatuses used in this study to support their findings. More details about the experiment conducted in this research should be added by the authors	The authors did not include any Figure(s) or plots of apparatuses as per their belief, the procedures used are standard and any one can re-plicate the experiments.
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	