

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_97328
Title of the Manuscript:	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
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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The paper is important for scientific community. It is written on a relevant topic, as identifying alternative energy sources is essential for ensuring the well-being of households. The paper contains a thorough critical analysis of previous studies' results. The author(s)' research is based on conducting surveys and analyzing secondary data sources. The paper contains a proper justification of the research methodology, in particular, the choice of survey methods and sample formation. Research results are presented in the form of tables and figures. The author(s) state the study results and provide their meaningful interpretation. The paper also has a practical aspect reflected in the recommendations. Thus, the paper is well-founded, contains the results of original research, and may be recommended for publication as is.</p> <p>2. The title of the paper is suitable.</p> <p>3. The paper's abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. Structure of the paper is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Paper is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and mostly recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language's quality of the paper is suitable for scholarly communications.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pavlo Hryhoruk
Department, University & Country	Khmelnytskyi National University, Ukraine