



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_67311
Title of the Manuscript:	Fuels for Automobiles; The Sustainable Future
Type of the Article	Minireview 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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is with some merits for Journal of Energy Research and Reviews, however, it requires some major revisions.</p> <p>Firstly, for Section 1, authors should provide the comments of the cited papers after introducing each relevant work. What readers require is, by convinced literature review, to understand the clear thinking/consideration why the proposed approach can reach more convinced results. This is the very contribution from authors. In addition, authors also should provide more sufficient critical literature review to indicate the drawbacks of existed approaches, then, well define the main stream of research direction, how did those previous studies perform? Employ which methodologies? Which problem still requires to be solved? Why is the proposed approach suitable to be used to solve the critical problem? We need more convinced literature reviews to indicate clearly the state-of-the-art development. And very importantly, authors always have to write a paragraph saying: "The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 contains the literature review. Section 3 contains the methodology (method). Section 4 contains the results. Section 5 contains the conclusions and policy implications". So, the reader knows what's coming next.</p> <p>For Section 2, authors should introduce their proposed research framework more effective, i.e., some essential brief explanation vis-à-vis the text with a total research flowchart or framework diagram for each proposed algorithm to indicate how these employed models are working to receive the experimental results. It is difficult to understand how the proposed approaches are working. For the employed data set, please provide more details illustration.</p> <p>For Section 3, authors should use more alternative models as the benchmarking models, authors should also conduct some statistical test to ensure the superiority of the proposed approach, i.e., how could authors ensure that their results are superior to others? Meanwhile, authors also have to provide some insight discussion of the results.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	None.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>It is with some merits for Journal of Energy Research and Reviews, however, it requires some major revisions.</p> <p>Firstly, for Section 1, authors should provide the comments of the cited papers after introducing each relevant work. What readers require is, by convinced literature review, to understand the clear thinking/consideration why the proposed approach can reach more convinced results. This is the very contribution from authors. In addition, authors also should provide more sufficient critical literature review to indicate the drawbacks of existed approaches, then, well define the main stream of research direction, how did those previous studies perform? Employ which methodologies? Which problem still requires to be solved? Why is the proposed approach suitable to be used to solve the critical problem? We need more convinced literature reviews to indicate clearly the state-of-the-art development. And very importantly, authors always have to write a paragraph saying: "The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 contains the literature review. Section 3 contains the methodology (method). Section 4 contains the results. Section 5 contains the conclusions and policy implications". So, the reader knows what's coming next.</p> <p>For Section 2, authors should introduce their proposed research framework more effective, i.e., some essential brief explanation vis-à-vis the text with a total research flowchart or framework diagram for each proposed algorithm to indicate how these employed models are working to receive the experimental results. It is difficult to understand how the proposed approaches are working. For the employed data set, please provide more details illustration.</p> <p>For Section 3, authors should use more alternative models as the benchmarking models,</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>authors should also conduct some statistical test to ensure the superiority of the proposed approach, i.e., how could authors ensure that their results are superior to others? Meanwhile, authors also have to provide some insight discussion of the results.</p>	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Wei Chiang Hong</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>School of Computer Science and Technology, Jiangsu Normal University, China</i></b>