

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Citation should be removed from the abstract• Since the study focuses more on emission reduction rather than energy saving-direction, a more suitable topic would be Carbon emission efficiency, rather than Energy efficiency.• Authors should provide critical definitions of energy efficiency and which of the definitions apply to this study.• Reference source of Fig 1 should be provided• The study location is not well defined, authors should give detail about the case study and the reason for choosing it.• All the tables have no caption. Authors should provide them• The table in the conclusion section has no number and caption and should be moved into the discussion section.• The conclusion only captures emission reduction with no particular mentioning of energy-saving innovations identified in the study. Author should give some of the process intensification measures that enhanced energy efficiency.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Quite comprehensive	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adefarati Oloruntoba
Department, University & Country	China University of Petroleum Beijing, China