



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_41531
Title of the Manuscript:	General Knowledge of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Powered Vehicle Users in Ghana: A Case Study of Tema Community 1
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	- No keywords included - Theoretical literature review too long. - Why using LPG requires very little infrastructure? - Why there was no enforcement of regulations and code of practices? - There was contradicted statement about existing regulations and code of practices on LPG safe handling in section 2.5 and section 2.5.3. Need to be sure about this. 75 (6.25%) sampling of 1200 taxis using LPG is too little and not representative of the population concerned. Need more representative samples. - It is not clear whether statement on 40% of respondents stated that LPG is more efficient covering more mileage at a lower cost is the author survey results or Liu et al., 1997 results. - Where is Figure 4.5? - There were a lot of wrongly quoted figures number such as 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 etc. make sure figure number quoted in the text is right for the discussion. - Why the place for the conversion take place was not one of the survey parameters? This is one of the most important parameter of study. - It is not clear whether all studied or survey parameters were clearly spell out or included in the existing regulation and code of practices of using LPG. - Some of listed references were not cited in the text, such as Ababio et al., 2003; Anon (2010a); Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2000;. Some cited references were not listed in the references, such as Anon, 2014; Ababio et al., 2014; Anon, 2012; Ghausi & Gronhaug, 2003; - Only 4 listed references were current references (less than 5 years). Need more recent references.	- keywords are included - Theoretical literature review has been reduced; - Why using LPG requires very little infrastructure has been omitted for clarity. - Why there was no enforcement of regulations and code of practices? Ghana do not have such codes for LPG use in vehicles - There was contradicted statement about existing regulations and code of practices on LPG safe handling in section 2.5 and section 2.5.3. Need to be sure about this. This has been rectified. 75 (6.25%) sampling of 1200 taxis using LPG is too little and not representative of the population concerned. Need more representative samples. Statistics has been updated for better appreciation. - It is not clear whether statement on 40% of respondents stated that LPG is more efficient covering more mileage at a lower cost is the author survey results or Liu et al., 1997 results. It is results from the survey - Where is Figure 4.5? indicated now - There were a lot of wrongly quoted figures number such as 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 etc. make sure figure number quoted in the text is right for the discussion. Corrected - Why the place for the conversion take place was not one of the survey parameters? This is one of the most important parameter of study. Not part of the scope of the survey - It is not clear whether all studied or survey parameters were clearly spell out or included in the existing regulation and code of practices of using LPG. Comments not very clear - Some of listed references were not cited in the text, such as Ababio et al., 2003; Anon (2010a); Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2000;. Some cited references were not listed in the references, such as Anon, 2014; Ababio et al., 2014; Anon, 2012; Ghausi & Gronhaug, 2003; corrected - Only 4 listed references were current references (less than 5 years). Need more recent references. These has been updated with current articles
Minor REVISION comments	- There were some repeated statements. Need to make sure there is no repeated statement in the manuscript. - Not consistent figure number was used. Format and numbering must be consistent.	Repetitions removed Work well formatted
Optional/General comments	In general, the manuscript is just reporting survey data without adequate representative respondents, details an depth discussion with cross references. It was not carefully written.	