

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_111646
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DI-TERT BUTYL PEROXIDE ON DIESEL ENGINE PERFORMANCE FUELLED BY BIODIESEL BLENDS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript appears to be of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly those involved in renewable energy and engine performance.  2. The title of the article, "EFFECT OF DI-TERT BUTYL PEROXIDE ON DIESEL ENGINE PERFORMANCE FUELLED BY BIODIESEL BLENDS", seems suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the study. It clearly states the main variables being investigated.  3. The abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It provides a brief overview of the motivation behind the study, the methods used, and the key findings.  4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate. They follow a logical order, starting with an introduction, followed by materials and methods, results and discussion, and finally conclusions.  5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methods used are clearly described and the results are presented in a clear and understandable manner.  6. The references listed appear to be relevant to the study. However, the most recent reference is from 2012, which might suggest that some more recent literature could be included to ensure the research is placed within the context of the latest developments in the field. Without specific expertise in this area, I can't suggest additional references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. The manuscript is well-structured, and the sentences are coherent and clear. The use of technical terminology is appropriate for the subject matter. However, a thorough proofreading by a native English speaker could be beneficial to ensure optimal readability and clarity. This would help to identify and correct any minor grammatical or syntactical errors that might be present.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nigam Bam Malla
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal