

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103345
Title of the Manuscript:	CASE STUDY ON POWER GENERATION FROM AGRIVOLTAIC SYSTEM IN INDIA
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is the case study representing the possibility of large scale production solar power generation</p> <p>Title is okay.</p> <p>Abstract is also satisfactory except that in last line Authors claims that this case study is comparable to global data, which needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of manuscript is okay.</p> <p>Yes. Manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes references look good.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Quality of English is not so good. There are so many grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>3. Abstract last line needs to be updated. This case study is not comparable with global PV data, which need thorough review of all major PV plants. It is beyond the scope of this manuscript.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sunita Barot</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USA</b>