

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_85356
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy Root and Energy Transformation Stages
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1) The Introduction should be enlarged and a recent literature in this research field should be added.</p> <p>2) Methodology – firstly, it is not clear did the mentioned experiments are performed by the Author(s), or the experiments and its results are taken from the literature. If the experiments are performed by the Author(s), then a detail presentation of experimental setup, as well as measurement procedure and measurement equipment for each energy transformation is required. Without details related to the measurements, measuring equipment accuracy, etc. it is impossible to properly evaluate presented results. It seems that the experiments are performed by the Author(s), so the measuring equipment, measuring procedure and all the details related to the measurements are required.</p> <p>3) The results (Table 1 to Table 10) should be presented along with its explanations, not independently as presented at the moment. It is very difficult to properly read the presented research, because the reader must constantly turn back through the paper for proper connection of the results with its explanations. Therefore, a much better paper arrangement is required.</p> <p>Moreover, it seems that the presented results are not exact, but only a general and overall, which is surely not expected. For example, there is no such machine which efficiency is equal to 100% in real operation (Table 2), electric voltage is not always exactly equal to 240 V (in real operating conditions) – but in the presented results electric voltage is always identical to 240 V, etc.</p> <p>4) Conclusion section is too short and only descriptive – it should be notably enlarged with the most important results obtained in the presented analysis.</p> <p>5) It is not clear (at least to me) which scientific novelty this research presents and what scientific contribution it brings in the specific research field.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vedran Mrzljak
Department, University & Country	University of Rijeka, Croatia