

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_108373
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICIENT PYROLYSIS OF WOOD CHIPS FEASIBILITY IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES: EXPERIMENTATION ON PRODUCT YIELDS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>No. Feasibility of Efficient Pyrolysis of Wood chips and its Product Yield in Developing Countries</p> <p>No. Abstract are written in block form without space but the author presented his own otherwise with paragraphs</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sufficient but did not follow pattern of reference writing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the language and english in some aspect of the article are appalling</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Abstract needs to be rewritten</p> <p>2. Check the 2referencing style citations used by the author in the write- up</p> <p>3. The introduction is flawed with grammatical errors and inconsistence sentences. It needs total review</p> <p>4. The Materials and method should be stated with more clarity</p> <p>5. The results and discussion was not properly presented</p> <p>6. The conclusion does not totally/concisely align with the objectives of the work, this should be reviewed to conformed with the results of the work done.</p> <p>7. The whole write up was not justified (not aligned)</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:	Joshua Oyebode Adekunle
Department, University & Country	Nigeria