

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_103466
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical, economic and environmental feasibility for the construction of an interactive solar classroom in Lérída, Tolima; Colombia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? <p>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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract is too long. Please follow the word limitations (100-250 words). The abstract must contain: backgrounds (if any, maximum 2-3 sentences), short clear objectives, short methods, final results or findings, and conclusion. 2. The results for all Tables required more explanations, discussions and comparison with other studies is required. 3. Compare the results for a previous studies to make your work more acceptable. 4. Conclusions should only answer the objectives of the research. Tells how your work advances the field from the present state of knowledge. Without clear Conclusions, reviewers and readers will find it difficult to judge the work, and whether or not it merits publication in the journal. Provide a clear scientific justification for your work, and indicate possible applications and extensions. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nabil Majd Alawi
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq