

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_92542
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal Control of 3.5 MW Solar Hybrid Power Plant of Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi Benue State, Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>This paper presents an Optimal Control of 3.5 MW Solar Hybrid Power Plant of Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi Benue State, Nigeria. From the technical aspects, the paper has enough contribution. However, there are some major and minor issues that need to be addressed:</p> <p>1- In introduction, some credits to the recent works are suggested to enrich the literature like Solar energy, Volume 183, 1 May 2019, Pages 1-16; Engineering Review, 2021, 41 (2), 26-40; WSEAS TRANSACTIONS on SYSTEMS and CONTROL, 2020, 15 (37), 356-365; Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems, 2019, 5 (1), 1-17; International Journal of Control Systems and Robotics, 2019, 4, 115-123 ;ISA Transactions, 2016 (60), 333-347; ICIC Express Letters, 2017, 11 (4), 763-772; Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing, 2018 (100), 466–481; International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Software Applications, DOI: 10.1109/ICEESA.2013.6578380</p> <p>2- In terms of theory, this reviewer needs to see more to justify that this work gives new contributions. The motivation of the study should be further emphasized. In particular, the main contributions of the results in this paper should be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p>3- The unique features of the proposed study and the main advantages of the results over others must be clearly commented. And a comparison with existing results will be useful to demonstrate the usefulness of this paper. In particular, the advantages and contributions of this paper compared with others should be highlighted.</p> <p>4- More physical interpretation and explanations are required to be discussed in the presented graphs.</p> <p>5- Some related papers need to be added in the revision version and some outdated references can be removed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chiheb Ben Regaya
Department, University & Country	ENSIT University, University of Tunis, Tunisia