

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_100596
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of WOA-based LSSVM model for wind speed prediction in Mianyang
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. Lacks details</p> <p>No, needs amendment</p> <p>Neutral. Needs strong modifications</p> <p>Not sufficient. Has to incorporate recent papers like 2022, 2023</p> <p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I recommend writing of full name of abbreviated terms in topics, e.g. WOA, LSSVM -Software tools used needs to be mentioned in abstract -English needs to be improved. There are long statements in background -Spacing is not used after last statements in many places. -Before coming to results, I have been expecting sufficient information regarding optimization algorithms, wind speed variation phenomenon, prediction strategies & relevances, nature of wind turbines and characteristics, their models and how all those information are related with wind speed prediction and their effect on grade stability. However, unfortunately all this information are missed in the paper. -In results section, the author claims as the wind data over 20 year obtained using Xiaomaiya website. However, what about this website is not described. A bit explanation. Moreover, the minimum required wind speed for power production is not mentioned in the paper. The wind speed after prediction can run the turbine or not is not known. -There is no naming for 'x' and 'y' axis of Fig.2 -Why the ration 8:1:1. is used in data set at your result section. Explain it. -Many abbreviations are not defined for their 1st use. e.g. XGBoost, CAT, MLP, RF, SVR, and LSTM -Give the name of 'x' axis of Fig.3. -Is the prediction of wind speed is over short term, medium or long term of the future? I didn't find it. -Yes, wind speed prediction is very good for estimation and control of power fluctuations to ensure power stability. However, I missed most of the important terms in this paper. Affecting factors like humidity, temperature, gust..are not mentioned or described in this paper. -Are the predicted results important for already running wind turbines or future constructions? -How it can implemented in real time situation and how can be validated. -What is the main difference of this prediction results with that of meteorological results? -How directly wind prediction results be related with grid stability? <p>So much improvement is needed in the paper even though it is very interesting</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs improvement	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Serious modification is needed	

[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:	Milkias Berhanu Tuka
Department, University & Country	Adama Science and Technology University, Ethiopia