

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>)

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>There are many recommendations the author have to check:</p> <p>1-The abstract is not clear, the author needs to state the problem statements, objective, motivation, and the main contribution in this paper.</p> <p>2-In the introduction part, strong points of this proposed method should be further stated and the organization of this whole paper is supposed to be provided in the end.</p> <p>3-The authors need to improve the English language of the paper significantly (typos, grammar, sentence building, and so on).</p> <p>4-References should be rewritten in one style, the authors need to use the referencing style considered in a template.</p> <p>5-More formatting issues are presented throughout the paper (font type, extra spaces, no spaces, etc.). The authors need to address these issues.</p> <p>6-Most of the figure captions are not appropriate. Should provide comprehensive figure captions.</p> <p>7-Please indicate how many times all the theoretical in this article has been done and whether the data is fortuitous.</p> <p>8-The conclusion drawn from the study are acceptable but some of the conclusions are not mentioned/explain in the discussion part. The conclusion should extract from the results and discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ameer Abed Jaddoa
Department, University & Country	Russia