

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_103165
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ALAOJI-ONITSHA TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT AND RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) plays a significant role in all developmental projects that require the people of the project location to be moved due to the project actions or outcome. Therefore, research on the environmental impact of the transmission line project and resettlement action plan is essential for the scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of the articles in English is sufficient and suitable for scientific communication. However, there are some minor errors, especially in the choice of words and punctuation marks such as spaces and commas. Please re-read the script and correct the parts that don't fit.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In subchapter 3.1. in research methods, social sentences must be replaced with the environment according to the topic and research objectives to be studied. - In the 4. discussion section, avoid using possibility statements. 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pribadyo
Department, University & Country	Teuku Umar University, Indonesia