



Paper: “Design and Implementation of an Experimental Thermoelectric System From Wood Waste”

Submitted: 18 December 2024

Accepted: 06 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Ngahane Emilienne Laure

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p41](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p41)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valentina-Mariana Manoiu
University of Bucharest, Romania

Reviewer 2: Benard Otieno Ojwang
Maseno University, Kenya

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Valentina-Mariana MANOIU	
University/Country: University of Bucharest, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: January 9, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: January 13, 2025
Manuscript Title: Design and implementation of an experimental thermoelectric system from wood waste	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33/06.01.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Just a few errors. I marked them... Please, correct them!</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>There are some small errors regarding the numbering of figures and the mention of these numbers in the text. I marked the errors... Please correct them!</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Small errors! Please correct them!</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Please see the text and my comments.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: BENARD OTIENO OJWANG	
University/Country: MASENO UNIVERSITY-KENYA	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/1/2025	4/2/2025
Manuscript Title: Design and implementation of an experimental thermoelectric system from wood waste	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN:1857-7881 (print)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Production of electronic energy is missing in the title yet from the specific objectives, it appears that this is the dependent variable while design and implementation of an experimental thermoelectric system from wood waste is the dependent variable</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods, and results, but it should be organised to flow from the background, statement of problem, justification, objectives, methods, and results in that order</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	No (4)
<i>Grammatical errors are minimal. However, the study should appear in reported form</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes (4)
<i>Methods are clear</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References should be as per the guideline of the journal</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author (s) should do the minor revisions that have been highlighted herein.