

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_108045
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementing Distributed Ledger Technology for Advanced Supply Chain Optimization in the Renewable Energy Sector: A Comprehensive Examination
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The issues addressed in the manuscript has great scientific value especially in data base management, control and security. The title of the article is reflecting the content; hence it is appropriate for the article. The abstract is relatively clear, but still slightly disconnected from the aim or objective of the article. Yes, the subsections are clear, but the structure is not clear enough as to what problem the authors addressed, or what new knowledge was offered. Yes, the article is scientifically fit, however, I think it well be better if the authors include results and discussion of data collected from the questionnaire as stated in the abstract. Yes, the references are sufficiently enough, recent and quite relevant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the authors should be clearer with the issue or knowledge gap they intend to address. They also need to be very clear with what new contribution they are making A "Nobel approach" was mentioned in the abstract which I think was not justified in the body of the article. I also think the structure of the article lacked scientific approach 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	In my own opinion, the quality of communication of the article is satisfactory	
<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:	Victor Ogenyi Uduah
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria