

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_86534
Title of the Manuscript:	Likelihood of Adopting Briquette Technology in Abundance of Competitive Energy Sources: A Case Study of Morogoro Urban and Rural Districts, Tanzania
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	The recommended major revision refers to: -scientific language corrections, which appear as annotated observations on the censored manuscript attached to the review; -English language corrections that can be done at least with the text editor or special programs (Grammarly free or higher version, possibly other programs); - corrections for observing the diary format (quotations, etc.). No corrections are required on the scientific background, but only suggestions (for the possible increase of the level), in the general comments section.	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	The problem of using wood briquettes is a widely debated one in the economic, industrial, and technical, but also in the scientific world. Tanzania has extensive concerns in this area, already using fixed or mobile wood briquetting facilities. The reviewed work provides an original study in this landscape, namely a statistical analysis of hierarchy intended to provide answers to the causes that still slow down the widespread use of wood briquettes. Using opinion polls and statistical analysis of the ranking of the scores recorded by five existing opinions in the tests proposed to the respondents. The analysis provides useful information for the orientation of energy producers and consumers of this type. To increase the quality of the article, we suggest the authors: -introduction of an informative comparative table about the prices of the energy sources that appear in the paper and about their caloric power; - introduction of photos with lighters and production facilities.	

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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	INMA Bucharest, Romania