

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_93049
Title of the Manuscript:	Wind Energy Resource Utilization: A Review of its Necessity, Interception Technology and Implementation Challenges
Type of the Article	Review 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Acronyms and abbreviations should be clearly defined on their first occurrence in the text by writing the term out in full and following it with the abbreviation in round brackets. For example: Vertical Axis Wind Turbines (VAWT). The author is suggested to check the same with other abbreviations also. 2) I suggest the author to reform the abstract by conveying the main findings, focus and indicating the conclusions drawn, to get a better impact. 3) The Keywords are missing in the paper. Keywords are words that hold the essence of the paper. It makes the paper searchable and ensure that the paper get more citations. Therefore, the author is suggested to include the most relevant keywords that will help other authors to search the paper. 4) There are many grammatical errors in the paper. The author is suggested to check and revise them. 5) Citations were found in figures. Any image that is taken from another source also needs the copyright permission; it is not enough just to cite the source. 6) Citations were found in the conclusion. References should be generally avoided in conclusions. If you have already cited the ideas earlier in the paper that you are summarizing in your conclusion, you do not need to cite them again. If a statement is your own conclusion based on the information you have drawn from outside sources, then as long as you note what information you got from sources by referencing correctly within the body of the document, where you explain how you came to your conclusion. 7) Check the referencing style of journal and adopted it throughout the manuscript. Check 11, 14 etc. For example, To Cite a Blog Post, the structure should be: Last, F. M. (Year Month Date Published). Article title [Type of blog post]. Retrieved from URL. 8) The author is suggested to make a fuller investigation in the same field to make this paper more sufficient and useful for the readers. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	The literature review and study of the paper is not well documented. The study aim is not captured. The author is suggested to reform it properly.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhilash
Department, University & Country	India