

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_108512
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLAR-WIND-POWER HYBRID POWER GENERATION SYSTEM
Type of the Article	

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>Thank you for giving a chance for reviewing the manuscript entitled "SOLAR-WIND-POWER HYBRID POWER GENERATION SYSTEM". By saying this, I directly forward my concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ In general, the paper addresses an interesting issue, ✚ From the very beginning, the title is not reflective of the major tasks of the authors, or the objective of the paper. What is/are the major concern of the author/s in this paper; design, or simulation, or implementation, or other? Through what approach/algorithm? The title should be reflective & precise! ✚ The abstract should need major revision. ✚ Unfortunately, the literature review is inadequate. It lacks recent literature survey (i.e., the most recent reviewed paper is published in 2018). ✚ In your simulation part you have to discuss clearly, how different dynamic characteristics affects the system stability and power quality of the hybrid system. ✚ Algorithm and equipment selection criteria is one part of system design. Why the authors select PMSG over IG? Why not DFIG? Why P&O over other MPPT algorithms? The paper didn't address this all. ✚ The overall system parameters are not mention. How can you simulate the overall system in MATLAB/Simulink? At least you have to append the simulation parameters. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The literature review should be improved. Pleased avoid lumping references and introduce references in a one-by-one manner. In bibliography, please follow consistent citation format (i.e., [4],[19], [30] lacks journal name; [8] is compacted; [25] has different format). Avoid website citation (i.e., [7], [9], [13], [36]). I didn't find most of references in the body of the manuscript. ▪ Figures can be made clearer, they are difficult to read, and lacks labelling and brief discussions. ▪ The simulation cases are not enough to validate the presented ideas. More results with more discussions should be provided to verify the work. ▪ To much keywords with typo and duplication (i.e., P & O is one category of MPPT algorithm). In your abstract, you mention STATCOM as the key word, in contrast you suggest it in your conclusion. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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:	Ashenafi Belihu Tadesse
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia