

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_97265
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential Usage of Selected Agro-Residue as a Biofuel Production Sources: Physiochemical Evaluation Approach.
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The structure of manuscript is appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent. However, the references must be written uniformly according to the style of referencing used in this journal Figures must be given relevant titles and descriptions: Figure 1 Figure 2 In the abstract and the main body of the paper: introduce each acronym before using it in text. The first time you use the term, place the acronym in parentheses after the full term. After that, you can stick with the acronym. It is suggested to put tables (Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3) as near as possible to the place where you first refer to it.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language is suitable for scientific communication, but still needs to be improved to achieve better quality. There are some errors in English writing, including run-on sentences and other accidents.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is worth to be published with some corrections.	

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:	Ayong Hiendro
Department, University & Country	Tanjungpura University, Indonesia