

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105783
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Growth and Sustainable Development in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>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 important, but need to be major revision</p> <p>Title was general, please specific to the investigation in this project.</p> <p>No. please do major revision.</p> <p>No. does not follow the correct format of review article</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Not enough.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract should be in one paragraph. 2. Introduction should be tackling the literature review comprehensively and aims for this study. 3. Methodology should have flowchart and subtopic the method you use to solve the problem. 4. Result and discussion should be reflecting the finding, 3.1 not result, it should be the subtopic of the finding. 3.2 Not direction discussion, it should be the finding. 5. All the figure (graph) please put the y and x axes. Delete the title of the graph because you already put the caption. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. grammar should be improved</p>	
<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:	Norazila Othman
Department, University & Country	School of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia