SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_56953**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Forecasting Solar PV Demand Split and Fuel Wood Usage Reduction in Eriti and Oke-Agunla Villages in Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Data 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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 study examined solar Photovoltaic demand split and fuel wood usage reduction in Eriti and Oke-Agunla villages, that were among the pilot sites for solar electrification programs in the western ecological region of Nigeria. It elicited information from 241 solar PV users, on alternative energy sources for provision of energy services using questionnaire techniques. Model for Analysis of Energy Demand (MADE-II) was used for the study.	
	The study also adopted scenario analysis techniques widely used as scientific method for dealing with the basic inherent uncertainty about future evolution of various variables driving the energy demand. This becomes essential in evaluating available policy options for optimal future contribution of solar PV and fuel wood usage reduction in the energy mix for the study areas to achieve the second study objective.	
	However, there are errors in the article (eg Key Woords, KWh), → Key words, kWh	
	The article did not provide a scientific basis to build 241 interview questions. Why are there 241 questions, what is the accuracy of the selection? Need to provide a clear scientific basis	
Minor REVISION comments	Figure 1, need to explain each step of implementation	
Optional/General comments	This article may be published, however it is required to be revised. Especially the basis of selecting the number of interview questions, calculation methods and languages	

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:	*Trinh Trong Chuong*
Department, University & Country	*Hanoi University of Industry, Vietnam*