Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_94649**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Overvoltages During Single-phase Earth Fault in Neutral-isolated Networks (10÷35) kV**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	**Comments** This work considered neutral or isolated networks, which is prone to voltage surges. The paper employed an arc-quenching device connected to the neutral of the network to protect the network and its accessories from the dangers (overvoltage and unstable arc formation) associated with the neutral or isolated networks. The paper clearly identified a technical problem and proffered an apt solution. **Abstract**: well written, Line 13: Neytral should be neutral; Line 22: $U_x = \sqrt{3}U_f$, this equation is better stated in words, otherwise, should be given equation number. The symbol, U (volt or V) and the subscripts (x and f) need definition for a reader comprehension. This comment applies to other sections of this manuscript; Line 34: Formulation of the problem. Single-phase earth faults have been carefully analyzed by scientists (Mention few of the scientists or the source of the information). Example, U (voltV) or U (V); Lines 39 – 46: Define symbols and their units in the equations, which justify if the equations are dimensionally consistent; **MATERIAL AND METHODS**: well written, Lines 186 – 217: Ought to be part of problem formulation, placement in the results/discussion is wrong, as this equation are not developed by the authors. **RESULTS/DISCUSSION**: good, **CONCLUSIONS**: good, The paper is good for a review article; however, some of the technical issues mentioned need resolution.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Stephen Ndubuisi Nnamchi**
Department, University & Country	**Kampala International University, Uganda**