

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99413
Title of the Manuscript:	The Carbon Footprint Reduction Related to Domestic Heating Using Thermal Power Plant Waste Heat
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Environmental issues have now become a concern of many countries in the world. The thermal power plants that burn coal cause many problems, where the carbon emissions from to use of fossil fuels significantly increase the contribution of damage to the environment. Therefore, a paper to reduce the carbon footprint related to household heating using waste heat power plants is the right step and is very much needed in the future.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>4. Subsections and the structure of the manuscript need to be improved a little, especially in section 3 the results should be added to the discussion, while in section 4 only the conclusions do not need to be written an evaluation.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the articles in English is sufficient and suitable for scientific communication. However, there are some minor errors, especially in the choice of words and punctuation marks such as commas. Please re-read the script and correct the parts that don't fit.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It is better if the conclusions only answer the research objectives briefly and clearly. Furthermore, the statements relating to the evaluation in the conclusions section can be combined in the discussion in section 3.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pribadyo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Teuku Umar University, Indonesia</b>