

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_96277
Title of the Manuscript:	Green hydrogen as a potential solution for reducing carbon emissions
Type of the Article	Review

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)	Yes; the review is on the recent developments towards decarbonisation. Yes Yes; but the phrase, "gray" may be changed to "grey". The same may be done in the section "Type of Hydrogen, subsection 10. Yes Yes; however the manuscript highlight about the Carbon Capture and storage as well as the recent electrolysis method so as to enable the reader with better understanding. This may even be supported with some figures/images. Yes; but some of the fonts in reference 10 is not understandable. The author may correct the same.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The sections may be numbered properly; conclusion can have some more strong points.	

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:	S. Thangalakshmi
Department, University & Country	Indian Maritime University, India