

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_96588
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS OF HOUSEHOLD COOKING ENERGY CHOICE IN PUBLIC HOUSING ESTATES IN MAIDUGURI, NORTH-EAST NIGERIA
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		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<p>The article has good content and is relevant given the on-going global energy crises.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>Positive! The structure and subsections of the article are appropriate.</p> <p>Multinomial models are used for mutually exclusive options. To justify its use in this case, the authors should employ the utility assumption stating that the choice of a particular energy source was based on derivable maximum satisfaction.</p> <p>The referencing style is inconsistent. More recent references are strongly advocated.</p> <p>The author was able to identify some research gaps in literature</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The English quality is good	
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:	Chiikezie, C
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Nigeria