

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JERR_120075 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ENERGY AUDIT AND ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCE FOR SUSTAINABLE PROCESSING OF CASSAVA PRODUCTS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA. |
| Type of the 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, it is. It provides information of energy auditing practice by industries to reduce energy consumption, produce products with lower price and at the same time minimizing its ecological footprint. Which can be used as a best practice for other industries.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, it is quite comprehensive. It gives a glimpse of what is contained in the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, it gives a very good introduction. However, it would be nice to see more discussion in results subsection, for example how much these three industries can obtained financially or what are other benefits they will gain by implementing the recommendations from the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, I do. The methodology is well defined. As well as the process of data collection of production processes.</p> <p>Yes, they are quite sufficient</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, it is suitable.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>It is well written with appropriate subsections and structure.</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: | Niken Arumdati |
| Department, University & Country | Indonesia |