

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_125261
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing box type solar cookers by using Jatropha oil as sensible heat storage medium
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Solar cooker with sensible heat storage material used for various domestic application, heat can be stored and used at night or evening cooking is also possible.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the abstract of the article, objectives and problem definition written but needs to be revised for the understanding to readers too.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Advised to include scientific and technical sentence in abstract and conclusion section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add recent published research article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Advised to remove grammatical error in paper.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See the conclusion of the paper and if possible then add it in bullet form. So, it will be very helpful for readers. 2. Add recent research article. 3. Did error bars prepare by authors? 4. Add the future work. 5. Life cycle cost analysis done by researcher? 6. Comparison to other renewable cooking technology like biomass cookstove. 	

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:	Romilkumar M. Patel
Department, University & Country	Institute of Technology, Ganpat University, India