

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_112101
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of combustion properties of briquettes produced from three different biomasses sourced from Tarkwa, Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, this manuscript is beneficial to the scientific community. 2. Yes. 3. The abstract is too lengthy; it should be revised to be more concise and clearly articulated. The structure is a common format for organizing your abstract, representing the following key elements: Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. 6. These exemplary papers may be beneficial in enhancing the quality of your own manuscript in certain aspects. 7. The conclusion, serving as the conclusive segment within a research paper, plays a pivotal role in enhancing the reader's comprehension of the significance of your research. A well-crafted conclusion should integrate the following pivotal components: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restate Your Topic and Emphasize Its Importance: Initiate the conclusion by succinctly restating your research topic. A single, clearly articulated sentence is adequate for this purpose. Provide clarity on the importance of your topic. This section of the conclusion should maintain clarity, conciseness, and focus on communicating essential information. 2. Recapitulate the Main Points of Your Paper: Proceed to reiterate the fundamental concepts elucidated in your research paper. This can be achieved by revisiting the primary arguments introduced in the paper's introduction. Redefine the thesis statement in your conclusion, ensuring it is expressed differently from its initial presentation in the introduction. This aspect can be effectively conveyed within a single sentence. 3. Address Opposing Viewpoints, providing a Rationale for Readers to Align with Your Position: Recognize and counter opposing viewpoints, furnishing a compelling rationale for readers to align with your perspective. This necessitates a meticulous analysis of alternative perspectives and a persuasive argument supporting the superiority of your stance. 4. Include an Overview of Potential Avenues for Future Research: Conclude your research paper by offering a comprehensive overview of potential directions for future investigations. Identify areas warranting further exploration and propose avenues for expanding upon the present research. This forward-looking perspective imparts depth to your conclusion, leaving the reader with a profound sense of the broader implications and possibilities emerging from your study. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, language improvement is needed as I have identified numerous instances of misspelled words, grammar errors, formatting issues, and other discrepancies in the manuscript. 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Narong Wichapa
Department, University & Country	Kalasin University, Thailand