

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_100964
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of CO2 emission between methanol and gasoline
Type of the Article	Data 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>)

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community 2. The title needs modification as indicated on the manuscript 3. It represents the scope of the study. The Abstract indicated the followings: Introduction, the methodology, the problem to be solved, results and conclusion. Please correct all the necessary grammar. 4. The subsections are appropriate but require the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. This section should be added to make the work significant 5. YES 6. More than 50% of the References are within the last 5 years. They are recent and sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality are very good except minor adjustments in Chemical Formulae	
Optional/General comments	Overall the paper is good. Accept as a full paper after minor corrections on the manuscript	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aliru Olajide Mustapha
Department, University & Country	Kwara State University, Nigeria