

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_86269
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of a Heating Chamber for Air Turbines: A Method of Optimizing Its Efficiency
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Indicate work done by past studies, what they have been able to do what they have not done and the gaps this study seeks to address.2. Clearly show how the rest of the paper is organised <p>Empirical and methodological framework</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. These sections are missing, since this work has been done by other scientists then this analytical framework is important.2. This paper is methodologically weak in that it does not elaborate the details on how information and evidence was obtained. <p>Conclusions and further research</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Conclusion is to brief and incoherent2. Area for further research not included.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>To work on a number of grammatical and editorial errors</p> <p>To use numbered referencing as per this journal’s accepted standards</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Nomenclature could either come after the abstract since its of notations to be used in the text</p> <p>Or to be in the appendix</p>	

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:	Geoffrey Ssebabi Mutumba
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda