

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_100998
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of the mirror reflectance coefficient on the performance of the compound parabolic trough concentrator (CPC) : Numerical and experimental simulation in a Sahelian environment
Type of the 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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community because it evaluate the performance of the compound parabolic trough concentrator according to three different values of the mirror reflectance coefficient.</p> <p>2. Yes the title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract can be improved if the author can presented the most important results which show the novelty of the proposed method</p> <p>4. The author should organised this work around following 4 parts: introduction; materials and methods; results and discussion; conclusion</p> <p>5. No the paper is not scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The author should improve the references with relevant recent works.</p> <p>The authors should also compare their method with those in the recent works using evaluation coefficient such as MSE, RMSE, MAE, MAPE, F1 score, XCOOR, recall, regression The authors should also better present its method with a flowchart and explain clearly the working</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No the quality of language is not suitable for scholarly communications The author should improve their English language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper should be seriously improved by authors</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinny Junior Foba Kakeu
Department, University & Country	University of Douala, Cameroon