

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_100269
Title of the Manuscript:	Conformity assessment in Senegal: conformity tests in laboratories as the basis for Quality Infrastructure
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

	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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>To a certain level</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Revision is required</p> <p>1. section 3.1 spelling mistake in "Flucke multimeter" and in figure 2, it should be Fluke multimeter</p> <p>2. Table 2 , for 5V, 50Hz, standard value is 2,0000 whereas Instrument value is 2,00? there is lot of difference</p> <p>3. For the same caliber values how there can be different standard values?</p> <p>4. The discharge depends on time of discharge and the current at which it is discharging. both the cases are shown for different discharge time and for different temperatures. The results are not discussed in detail</p> <p>5. The results obtained should be validated with mathematical calculations and the related mathematical expressions are not shown in this paper</p> <p>6. what is the cut-off voltage is it 1.8 V?. These have to be tested at rated current and need to be tallied with the manufacturers datasheet values</p> <p>7. Very few references, enough literature survey is not done</p>	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madhu Palati
Department, University & Country	BMS Institute of Technology and Management, India