



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_54680
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Fuel Material Composition on Combustion Properties of Wood Chips from Smallhold Farm Plots in a Sudano-Sahelian Environment of Nigeria
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The first few sentences of the Introduction are unclear. Are the authors arguing that climate change should lead to more use of fossil fuels (the so-called "clean cooking" position) or are you contending that fossil fuels are too expensive and thus one should optimize the use of woodfuels?</p> <p>Sentence 2 in paragraph 2 is too long and unclear.</p> <p>If the justification for this study is that low income people tend to use biomass (very true) then is the contribution of bark a critical issue? After all, low income biomass users are unlikely to take the bark off of stems. If you look at the improved cookstove adoption literature, you will see that many stoves are not popular because they require chopping wood into small pieces. Taking bark off is much harder without specialty tools which leaves me asking, is this study really of any practical value to low income biomass users? Also, would it not be better to study fresh or wet wood vs. dry wood? In other words, from a practical point-of-view, if we want to reduce the harm of burning biomass, would it not be better just to dry the wood rather than trying to remove bark?</p> <p>The study seems reasonable in terms of the framing question but that frame seems of little practical value at household level.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Ruth Mendum</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Penn State University, USA</b>