

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_99222
Title of the Manuscript:	Recent Advances in White Hydrogen Exploration and Production: A Mini Review
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. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article could be reviewed by the authors since the subsection used for describing the "Production" uses the word "Generation" rather than "Production" (Section 4). 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. This mini-review manuscript should be improved. 6. Regarding the hydrogen topic addressed in the mini-review, approximately 24% of the references are recent. The first five references are recent but are related to general information on alternative energies. Additional comments a) The authors should define the acronyms before using them. b) Section 4. WHITE HYDROGEN GENERATION PROCESSES must be enhanced. This section lacks processes of hydrogen generation. For example, water electrolysis. The conclusion must be enhanced. The authors should avoid using references, they have to provide their own conclusions and propose future works. c) Regarding the references, the authors should include new and recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Authors should review the manuscript detailed to avoid typos.	
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:	Ricardo Fabricio Escobar Jiménez
Department, University & Country	National Center for Research and Technological Development, Mexico