

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_91325
Title of the Manuscript:	VALIDATION OF GLOBAL SOLAR RADIATION MODELS ON A HORIZONTAL SURFACE IN THE CLIMATIC ZONES OF BURKINA
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I noticed some grammatical errors. I give some examples: "compared to the needs of an energy exploitation" should be "compared to the needs of energy exploitation". "Developing tools and technics to have more precise data becomes an imperative" should be "Developing tools and technics to have more precise data becomes imperative". "we used as data measurements of global irradiation on an hourly scale for the sites of Ouagadougou" should be "we used data measurements of global irradiation on an hourly scale for the sites of Ouagadougou". "and which has a daily irradiation equal to the monthly average" should be "and which has daily irradiation equal to the monthly average". "a period covering the whole year in order to have a high representativeness of the results" should be "a period covering the whole year to have high representativeness of the results". And there are others. The paper should under a thorough grammatical review. The main aim of the work should be mentioned in the abstract, conclusion and at the end of the introduction section. I suggest expanding the introduction. There are important results in DSSC field that should be cited so that the readers are provided by a solid background and progress. Therefore, I strongly require authors to expand the reference list to include the below citations in the revised manuscript: - Turkish Journal of Physics, Vol. 38, No. 1, 86–90 (2014). - International Journal of Renewable Energy Research, Vol. 4, No. 2, 384–388 (2014). - Optica applicata, Vol. 44, No. 2, 345–351 (2014). - Materials Science-Poland, Vol. 32, No. 4, 547–554 (2015). - International Journal of Renewable Energy Research, Vol. 5, No. 1, 294–298 (2015). - Journal of Nano- and Electronic Physics, Vol. 8, No 1, 01026(5pp) (2016). - Acta Physica Polonica A, Vol. 130, No. 3, pp 795-799 (2016). - Journal of Theoretical and Applied Physics, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp 265–270 (2016). More clarity of the figures are recommended. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	/	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sofyan A. Taya
Department, University & Country	Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine