

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_103311
Title of the Manuscript:	Heat Transfer Coefficient for a Glazed Transpired Solar Collector in Natural Convection Mode
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is properly written, almost free of grammatical errors. It has clear objectives; the authors properly addressed the problem and found a model which is consistent with results obtained in literature.</p> <p>Yes The abstract section is a direct copy of the conclusion part. It is better if this section is enriched and comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some references writing are not consistent. Please, see the highlighted ones from the attached manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grammatical errors are highlighted in yellow. Units of some physical quantities should be corrected. Maintain consistency of references writing Put full stop at the end of sentences, even after equations. There are some results which are not cited From Equation (13), s = 1.6 not s = -1.6 What the plus signs refer in Equation (8)? <p>See the highlighted ones and make corrections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eshetu Haile Gorfie
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar University, College of Science, Ethiopia