

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_113444
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT-VOLTAGE CHARACTERISTICS OF PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) SYSTEMS IN SELECTED CLIMATIC REGIONS IN CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript presents a comparative analysis of the current-voltage characteristics of photovoltaic (PV) systems in selected climatic regions in Cross River State, Nigeria. The study is significant for the scientific community. However, the manuscript requires improvement in both form and substance. 2. The title of the article is suitable, just change the capital letters to match the temple. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but a few corrections are needed 4. The different sections appear in the document, but the structure is not appropriate. In fact, we need to have (I) Introduction, (II) Materials and Methods, (III) Results and Discussion, and (VI) Conclusion and Perspectives. The study area described in 2.0 should be included in Materials and Methods. We should not have Recommendation and Conclusion, but Conclusion and Perspectives. 5. The manuscript is quite well correct as there are corrections to be made. 6. Around 60% of the references cited in the text are from before 2015. To ensure a comprehensive review, it is necessary to include more recent references as many studies have been conducted in this area. The bibliographic review only includes three references, which may not adequately demonstrate the relevance of the work. <p>In addition to the six points outlined above, authors are required to number all equations and include a 'Perspectives' section. Within the 'Study Area' section, authors must include a geographical map of both localities, Calabar and Okuku. In the 'Methodology' section, it is necessary to provide a figure that illustrates the experiment and to show the variations in daily or monthly solar radiation and temperature for both localities. Two values are insufficient to demonstrate the significance of the work. Authors must use either 'Figure' or 'Fig.' consistently throughout the text. They must also ensure correct citation of articles (Ettah et al., year) and include a space between numbers and units.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The quality of the language and English of the article needs to be improved. 	
<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:	Kory Faye
Department, University & Country	Alioune Diop University, Senegal