

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JENRR_96277</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Green hydrogen as a potential solution for reducing carbon emissions</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. This paper is expected to provide up-to-date information about green hydrogen. 2. The title of the article is not suitable. (The title remains but in the manuscript a discussion is added on how green hydrogen can reduce carbon emissions and add data on carbon emissions that can be derived. It not replace with "Hydrocarbon energy". 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In the discussion, sub-chapters can be added: 1. Green hydrogen production process 2. existing utilization 3. Future utilization potential	

### 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:	<b>Warji</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Lampung, Indonesia</b>