

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_100271
Title of the Manuscript:	Compliance verification of photovoltaic solar components: the case of the laboratory for quality control of photovoltaic solar components (LCQS) in Senegal
Type of the Article	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Subject is good and adopt a novelty and it is beneficial for our community.</p> <p>Title is suitable and matched with the article.</p> <p>Abstract is not very fine. What is the meaning of "LCQS &amp; CERER", all text should be in full form, avoid short form in abstract and if you do then first write the complete form. Abstract is scattered, not define exactly what you say.</p> <p>Rest, of the paper was very smooth; graphs and figures are perfect.</p> <p>There are no major issues in the script but there is no calculation for standard units. How come the table no. 4 and 5 and what is the criteria to compare 4-5 table</p> <p>I don't understand why are you not refer any latest research paper, all the references in your paper from 2022-2023 are reports or case study. I think you have to add some more reference from latest article. References are relevant but not sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Language is good and easy to understand.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Acceptable after resolving the issues.	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Darsha Panwar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SISTec, India</b>