

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_119079
Title of the Manuscript:	MODIFICATION OF GROWTH MEDIA FOR <i>Scenedesmus</i> and <i>Nitzsch</i> spp. FOR FATTY ACID METHYL ESTERS PRODUCTION IN RACEWAY POND
Type of the 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>Content of the manuscript and work is relevant and contributing.</p> <p>Title is suitable but letter formatting should be uniform and acronyms should be avoided in the title.</p> <p>An abstract should reflect correctly the objectives and contents of the manuscript. Avoid unfamiliar terms, acronyms, abbreviations, or symbols (Should be defined if usage is necessary). Avoid citing references in the abstract.</p> <p>Letter formatting needs modification. (For eg. Introduction and Discussion contain capital letters except all other sections or sub sections).</p> <p>Manuscript is informative and contains potential findings but it must need revisions in content formatting. Clarity of expression with respect to logical structure is significant while preparing a manuscript.</p> <p>References are sufficient. However, some latest data and study should always be reviewed.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Manuscript provides reliable output of the research work and it effectively highlights its significance. However in my opinion, writing can be kept more skilful and polished for an organized and readable research paper. Grammatical alteration is needful at various places. I suggest rewrite of the introduction part and citing some recent research work. Figure 1 given in the manuscript is not clear. More figures can be included containing information of methodology utilized.</p> <p>I suggest revisions in the manuscript regarding sentence formation, structure, and comprehensibility.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meetu Singh
Department, University & Country	S.R. Govt. College for Women, India