

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_96011
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental evaluation of the performance degradation of a solar PV plant operating in a Sahelian climate
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The search for effective renewable energy sources is a global problem resulting from the depletion of fossil fuel deposits, environmental pollution, as well as constantly emerging political conflicts in various parts of the world. An additional problem in Africa is economic poverty, including energy poverty. At the same time, this part of the world has the greatest potential for solar energy, which is an inexhaustible resource. Therefore, conducting research on the efficiency of energy generation using photovoltaic devices is of great importance, especially in practice. Therefore, the manuscript submitted for review concerns an important problem of energy production efficiency in a selected region of Africa.</p> <p>2. The title matches the content of the article.</p> <p>3. The abstract is consistent with the content of the article and sufficient.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is divided into main chapters only, no sub-chapters, however, are not necessary.</p> <p>5. In each of the 3 years of the study, the PR index was lowest in May (Fig. 1). The IR index was also the lowest in May (Fig. 6). The authors write that the indicators were not dependent on the weather (p. 6, p. 8 Conclusions). So what was the cause of this regularity? This is not clear or justified by the Authors.</p> <p>6. The subject of PV is the subject of numerous studies in various parts of the world. Meanwhile, the authors refer to a small number of scientific articles (15 items). I believe that the Introduction chapter should be expanded by pointing out the problems related to the production of energy from RES in the studied region. In addition, it is worth referring to the results of more researchers in the discussion section. Technical notes for References: in items 1, 3 and 6, the source of the literature (journal, book?) must be clearly indicated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. In Figures 3 and 6, English should be used in the axis captions (names of months). In Figures 2, 3 and 4, all axis descriptions should be written in English.</p> <p>2. The numbering of all figures should be corrected because they are already incorrect from figure 3 onwards. Then, references to individual figures should be carefully corrected in the text of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Formula (1) - The formula should be written in English and then explain its individual elements below.</p> <p>4. The methodology (p. 3) should specify which correlations were tested.</p> <p>5. How was the PR index calculated?</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript requires substantive and technical improvement. I made some minor corrections in the text. After introducing changes and corrections, the article should be re-verified by the Editors.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alina Kowalczyk-Juśko
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Poland