

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_98538
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW OF IMPROVED COOKER STOVE UTILIZATION LEVELS, CHALLENGES AND BENEFITS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This paper is very good attempt aiming at the welfare of the economically backward countries. Implementing new technologies in developed countries is easy but in a country where people are struggling even for food, it is difficult and the author(s) have done a good job at reviewing the possibilities of implementing an improved cookstove in Zambia. 2. It looks appropriate. 3. Yes, but Some more technologies of cookstoves could be explored since it is review article. 4. The order of the subsections could be changed, 1.3,1.4 and 1.5 could be explained before explaining the cookstoves. 5. Yes. It is correct 6. Yes. Authors have cited enough references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes. Language is good enough to understand the author's view.	
Optional/General comments	Introduction and Literature Survey have a lot of repeated points. All the references suggesting the same point may be grouped together.	

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:	D. Poornima
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramakrishna Institute of Technology, India