

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_84134
Title of the Manuscript:	ENERGY EFFICIENCY BEST PRACTICES: A CASE STUDY IN AN INDUSTRIAL SITE
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> )

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<div>1. References should not be included in the abstract.</div> <div>2. The data in the final table lacks calculation basis. How to calculate the CO2 saving result should be added.</div> <div>3. The introduction should supplement the background of the case, especially explain its typicality as a representative of modern industry and advanced value of energy saving and carbon reduction.</div>	<div>1. References in the abstract have been removed</div> <div>2. More calculations added.</div> <div>3. I have modified the introduction in order to take in consideration this comment.</div>
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	