

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)	It is my first observation that the topic is very relevant and drew an attention to the problems of several hazards by the common cooking process and tried to provide a solution to the problem. However, the topic is region specific. Very much suitable. Yes the abstract of the article comprehensive. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically insufficient. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the paragraph 1.1 Historical Review of Cooking Stoves, only few has been discussed and few images are cited. Many more types are available and it should be included. In the paragraph 1.2 Improved cook stoves and pellets stove only few has been discussed and few images are cited. Many more types are available and it should be included. In the paragraph 1.5.1 gas stove body commented "it is crucial that all of these be taken into account while designing the improved cook stove". No conclusion is drawn. In the paragraph 1.5.2 Thermoelectric Generators (TEGs), with which ICS it is associated not discussed. Paragraph 1.7 to 1.11 it is available in the World bank online report. References are sufficient and recent. Authors should provide references outside of this report.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ratna Pal
Department, University & Country	Visvesvaraya Technological University, India