

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_100570
Title of the Manuscript:	A case study of an electrical efficiency audit in an industrial site
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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

<p>1. Abstract was poorly written. An abstract I'd a summary of your work, therefore it should contain: what was done, how it was done, in some cases,</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment Why it was done, how it was done and the results obtained.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrite abstract 2. First statement, and to a large extent, second statement, makes no sense. They are too vague. 3. Abstract doesn't contain methodology, it doesn't contain what was done. 4. Introduction: poorly written. Rewrite Introduction. 5. Literatures cited are too few, there author can't possible give informed judgement 6. Methods and materials: poorly written. Rewrite Introduction. 7. The materials used in the study wasn't mention in the method and materials. Specifically the equipment you see to gather the data. 8. Were figures 1 to 8 plotted by you? If yes, state the tool or software used in the plot. And why did you use the tool? 9. Discuss trends in your plots. You may reference similar trends from peered review journals. 10. Equation 1 is a generic equation, how come you "derived " a generic equation? 11. Derive your own equation, possibly from your regression plot of figure 1 12. Reference: use a singularly reference approved by the journal. Be consistent with the given format. 13. The references are two few 14. Results aren't properly discussed 	<p>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>
<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>	<p>More work has to been on this manuscript. It could be if more work is done</p> <p>Yes it's appropriate</p> <p>The abstract is poorly written</p> <p>No, subsections of the manuscript are not appropriate</p> <p>No, but it can be improved</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No, it can be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Larry Orobome Agberegba
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Nigeria