



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_50112
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of Biomass Briquettes using coconut husk and male inflorescence of Elaeis guineensis.
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	<p>The Abstract: was not properly written. There should be no paragraph or spacing in an abstract.</p> <p>The result obtained from the research was not properly captured to reflect the work carried out while the conclusion is defective</p> <p>1a. The sub title under here such as aims, study design etc should be deleted.</p> <p>1c. The result obtained from the research was not properly captured while the conclusion is defective</p> <p>2. Introduction: The words painted yellow should be included while the ones painted blue should be revised.</p> <p>3. Material collection and preparation: The words painted yellow should be included while the ones painted red should be deleted</p> <p>3b. Proximate analysis: heating value is another test not part of proximate. You omitted %moisture content in your Proximate analysis\</p> <p>3c. Your formula need ref. while you also need to number your equations</p> <p>3d. If you determine your heating value in the lab; then you should state the procedure and the equipment used with accompanied calculation.</p> <p>4. Results and Discussion: The words painted yellow should be included, the ones painted red should be deleted while the one painted blue should be revised.</p>	<p>All the reviews made were considered and effected in the manuscript.</p> <p>Moisture content was not determined in the proximate analysis.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Should consider revising the discussion of the research work by comparing your research data on their merit before referring to previous work done.</p> <p>Should effect those corrections made</p>	<p>All corrections are now effected in the manuscript.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>General restructuring of the write up to really bring out the research work done.</p> <p>General revision of the manuscript</p>	<p>Agreed and revised.</p> <p>Thanks to the reviewers</p>

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>	