

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_100816
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE COMBUSTION CHARACTERISTICS OF RICE HUSK AND COCONUT SHELL BRIQUETTES.
Type of the Article	Technical

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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> Fine Suitable Abstract needs rewriting giving the importance and need of the study and highlighting the results obtained with justification They are ok, but still author can give the appropriate structure and explain the results, it should be written like a technical paper. Acceptable , but still needs lot of justification and references related for the work and results. References are required of much relevance and latest ones. All are below 2018 or so. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	No, needs revision	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has author studied all the proximate and ultimate analysis. Is the starch percentage fixed and its not varied, is there any specific reason Many combinations still could be done for the better results It is a common type of study done for the energy evaluation, what is any innovative thing that has been done as such, can the author highlight on it. Fig 1: pictures are not clear Fig 2: write properly a) b) c) Results have to be discussed properly with proper reference and justification 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lokeshwari Navalgund
Department, University & Country	SDMCET, India