

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_102212
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affecting the efficiency of photovoltaic system
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>Yes it is important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract is not well written and so not comprehensive enough. I think abstract should contain the following: brief introduction of the work, aim of the work and few objectives, methods used, results and conclusion. The authors' work has no keywords.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are fairly appropriate. However, the author should take time to explain more for better understanding of the reviewer.</p> <p>His findings are scientifically correct but his explanation about the findings are shallow.</p> <p>The references are grossly insufficient for a review paper. I think a review paper should have at least more than sixty papers.</p> <p>He only dumped figure 1 in the work without making reference to it in the write up. Equations should be adequately referenced if they not theirs</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author should read over again for grammatical errors correction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agbetuyi Ayoade Felix
Department, University & Country	Covenant University, Nigeria