

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	Reviewed paper concerns "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." This paper is suitable for publication in South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics, but after the answer on the comments below: 1. The original points must be explained well. 2. In the abstract section, the aim, the methodology of the study, and the quantitative values of the results should be presented. Please rewrite the Abstract section 3. I think that there is some interesting aspect in this paper, but the overall presentation is very confuse and misleading. 4. What In the Introduction section, it is necessary to summarize the most recent studies on this subject. The authors can present the current studies given below in the Introduction section. 5. Quantify some of the main outcome in the conclusion	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Globally the English level should be substantially improved and the manuscript should be carefully proofread.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebhi Redha
Department, University & Country	University of Medea, Algeria