

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_97328</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determinants on the Choice of the Main Source of Cooking Energy by Households in Urban Areas of Tanzania: A Case of Kiwanja cha Ndege Ward in Morogoro Municipality</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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language is suitable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Accept manuscript for publication.</p> <p>1. Well written. Excellent research work on Assessment of the determinant on households' choice of the main source of cooking energy using quantitative data from primary and secondary sources. The study used descriptive statistics, the likelihood ratio Chi-Square test, and binary logistic regression analysis.</p> <p>2. The results shows that a large proportion of households in the ward used charcoal (84%), followed by gas (11.3%) as the main source of cooking energy. Fuelwood and Kerosene still show up in the study.</p> <p>3. The utilization of fuel in the Municipality reflects the fuel stacking hypothesis. This is not surprising because of fuel cost and irregularity of fuel supply in most African countries.</p> <p>4. The findings revealed that the age of the head of household and the household size have positive effects on the choice of charcoal as the main source of cooking energy although the effect was not statistically significant. The result is compared with similar studies in Sub-Saharan Africa and in Asia.</p> <p>5. In order to attain SDG 7 by 2030, government policy, education and increase in income will play a role.</p> <p>6. Overall: Very Good.</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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johnson Oluyemi Ojosu
Department, University & Country	Nigeria