

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_103221
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Feasibility of Gravitational Vortex Turbines for Sustainable Energy Production in Remote Hilly Areas of Bangladesh
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community by proposing the optimized design parameters.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is scientifically correct</p> <p>No the references are insufficient. Please add more and recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No there are lot of grammatical and typo errors. Please improve the English</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do more literature survey as paper lacks in it. Inadequate literature study. 2. There are lot of abbreviations and acronyms used in the paper which needs to be explained i.e., BPDB, BWDB, and IFRD of BCSIR etc. 3. There is no detail of numerical model and methodology used in the CFD analysis. 4. Validation of numerical model is also missing (compare the numerical model with some code or experimental data) 5. Add mesh independency studies as it is required to validate the used methodology. 6. Equations used in the paper are missing (typing error) see sub section 4.1 formulas considered and please add equation no. 7. Re-write the conclusion section (point wise) 8. Use superscript while writing the units 	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yasir Zulfiqar
Department, University & Country	Pakistan Institute of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Pakistan