

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105650
Title of the Manuscript:	IoT-Based Automated Solar Panel Cleaning and Monitoring Technique
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Papier Tilte : IoT-Based Automated Solar Panel Cleaning and Monitoring Technique</p> <p>This study aims to develop an automated system for cleaning solar panels and real-time monitoring based on IoT (Internet of Things) and utilizing a microcontroller to enhance the efficiency and performance of a solar module. In order to optimize the production of photovoltaic systems, it is highly beneficial to conduct practical studies aimed at improving the output of photovoltaic panels. This article has presented intriguing results.</p> <p>I) In the introduction</p> <p>1) In the introduction, the author must use a consistent citation system within the text. For certain references, square brackets ([]) are used, while for others, the author includes the date and the author's name without using square brackets ([]). This inconsistency poses challenges in locating these references in the bibliography.</p> <p>Example within this paragraph:</p> <p>A study by Kumar et. al. (2017) proposed a wireless sensor network-based system for monitoring solar panel performance. This has been shown to be effective in detecting faults and improving overall system efficiency [17].</p> <p>One study by Zhou et al. (2021) proposed an AI-based solar panel cleaning system that uses machine learning algorithms to detect the level of soiling on the panels and optimize the cleaning process accordingly. The study showed that the proposed system was more efficient and cost-effective than traditional cleaning methods [18].</p> <p>I suggest that the author corrects all of these errors.</p> <p>2) After 1-Introduction, right at the end of the introduction, it would be beneficial to provide an outline of the article's structure (e.g., the continuation of the article's plan).</p> <p>3) The citation of figures in the text lacks consistency. For instance, the author uses "Fig. 3" at times and "Figure 2" at other times. I recommend employing a consistent citation style throughout the document.</p> <p>4) There is an issue with the numbering of sections and subsections. For instance, the author initially labels a section as "4. Simulation Model" on page 5, and then labels another section as "3. Flow Chart" on page 6.</p> <p>I suggest addressing all these errors in numbering.</p> <p>5) The author should also correct "3. Flow Chart" and "3. Results and Discussion" on page 7.</p> <p>II) Part of Results and Discussion:</p> <p>6) I have observed numerous formatting errors and a few grammar and spelling mistakes in the document. I recommend that the author corrects all of these errors.</p> <p>7) Regarding the author's results, I noticed that the author did not compare their findings with results obtained from existing literature. I suggest that the author seeks published literature results to enhance their discussions by making comparisons with their own findings.</p> <p>8) The author should divide this section "3. Results and Discussion" into distinct sections or subsections. For example, it could be split into three parts.</p> <p>III) Part of Conclusion:</p> <p>9) For the conclusion, I recommend that the author divides the text into two or three paragraphs. They should remove all bullet points and aim to synthesize the conclusion, which is currently too lengthy. Additionally, the author should expand on the prospects and implications of this study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>IV) References:</p> <p>10) I have observed that the bibliography presented by the author lacks uniformity. The author should utilize a consistent style throughout.</p> <p>Example within this section:</p> <p>5. Bhuyan MH, Ali MA, Khan SA, Islam MR, Islam T, Akter J. (2023). Design and implementation of solar power and an IoT-Based pisciculture management system. Journal of Engineering Research and Reports, ISSN: 2582-2926. 24(2), 15-27.</p> <p>6. Paul NK. Saha D. Biswas K. Akter S. Islam RT. Bhuyan MH. (2023). Smart Trash Collection System – An IoT and Microcontroller-Based Scheme. Journal of Engineering Research and Reports, 24(11), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2023/v24i11849.</p> <p>I suggest that the author corrects all of these errors.</p> <p>In conclusion, the author has put in effort to develop this practical work on their platform. This effort has led to significant results. I am in favor of accepting the article, contingent upon the correction of all the errors mentioned in the document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dialo Diop
Department, University & Country	Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Senegal