

Review Form1.7

JournalName:	JournalofScientificResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JSRR_119322
TitleoftheManuscript:	Biomass-SolarEnergy:AComprehensiveReviewofSustainableEnergyGeneration
TypeoftheArticle	ReviewArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

	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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, particularly those focused on sustainable energy generation and policy development in India and other similar regions. The manuscript provides a comprehensive review that consolidates information on renewable energy sources, policy frameworks, technological advancements, and socio-economic impacts</p> <p>2. The title is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the focus and scope of the article.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a clear overview of the article's content, its relevance to sustainable development goals, and the specific focus on biomass and solar energy in India. It effectively summarizes the key points and findings that readers can expect from the full article.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. However, I noticed that the sections and subsections of the article are not numbered consistently. To improve the clarity and organization of the manuscript, I recommend numbering all sections and subsections appropriately.</p> <p>5. I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, To enhance the scientific rigor and accuracy of the manuscript, I recommend considering the proposed optional comments.</p> <p>I noticed that some of the references cited in the manuscript appear to be outdated. To ensure the accuracy and relevance of the information presented, I recommend using references that are up to date and reflect the latest research and developments in the field of renewable energy and sustainable development.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments

1. Is language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?

In general, the language quality seems suitable for scholarly communications. However, I noticed a few areas where improvements in language clarity and structure could enhance the manuscript's readability and impact, for example:

- Simplify complex statements, like "Overwhelming reliance on traditional energy sources has led to severe environmental risks, including unpredictable weather patterns, health issues, and global warming."
- Consider revising sentences for clarity and conciseness, such as rephrasing

Review Form1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The rise in the global population has increased demand for energy sources, which varies across countries" to "Global population growth has heightened demand for energy sources, varying significantly by country." •ect 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suggest renaming the second section of your manuscript as "Related Work" to better align with common academic terminology. 2. I found the figures could benefit from improved clarity. I recommend using vector graphics methods for creating figures to ensure they are clear and high-quality. Try using for example Visio tool. 3. I suggest improving the clarity of the tables included in your manuscript. Clear and well-organized tables are crucial for effectively presenting data and enhancing reader comprehension. 4. The figures/ tables should be mentioned before their appearance in the text. 5. I believe that the introduction would benefit from more detailed explanation. 6. I kindly urge the author to revise the manuscript to reduce the instances of plagiarism before final submission. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amal Satif</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>National School of Applied Sciences of Kenitra, Morocco</p>