

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_114598
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF WIND RESOURCE AND ITS ENERGY POTENTIAL IN THREE STATES OF NORTHWEST NIGERIA
Type of the 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>	<p>The topic of use of wind energy is important for the scientific community as well as for the society. The use of wind energy is important and especially in the African continent where it has a huge potential to become the leading power generation source and this paper also resent dame through different data analysis and visualization method.</p> <p>The title is find and appropriate.</p> <p>Abstract fine too.</p> <p>Yes they are fine but needed min or detailing and improvisation in some parts.</p> <p>Yes manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References and sufficient but not recent. Author need to add few more reference which is related to same work but done in the recent years. Author need to find few papers which is published in or after 2020.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes it is good enough to describe the finding in a proper and systematic way.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Page 1, Section 1 Introduction: 3rd paragraph 1st line "In Nigeria, about 40% of the population has access to grid-connected power, while the remaining 40% must rely on locally available energy sources like firewood and solar radiation (Ucar and Balo, 2009)." The values mentioned in this review is come out to be 80% in total rather than 100%. Check again and make the necessary changes.</p> <p>Page 7, Section 7 Weibull Parameters, (k and c):</p> <p>Last paragraph below fig 8 "The high values of the Weibull parameters ($k \geq 2$ and $c \geq 2$) imply that the data spread in a perfectly normal distribution (Carta <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Nze-Esiaga and Okogbue, 2014) and that the data spread exhibits good uniformity with relatively small scatter (Lipson and Sheth, 1973)." The value of k define whether the data spread is perfectly normal distribution or not. The value of c mainly decide the magnitude of the wind frequency/speed. The curve distribution mainly depends upon the value of k as it is the shape factor while c is the scale factor. The value of k is either be 1 or 2 or 3 and it will determine whether the curve will be perfectly normal distribution, left skewed or right skewed. So please check the claim again and make the necessary changes.</p> <p>Same issue in the page 8 1st paragraph and 2nd "The values of the Weibull parameters from the analysis ranged between $5.996 \leq k \leq 9.194$ and $5.958 \leq c \leq 8.592$ for Kano. The high values of the Weibull parameters ($k \geq 2$ and $c \geq 2$) imply that the data spread in a perfectly normal distribution"</p> <p>&</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>“The values of the Weibull parameters from the analysis ranges between $4.116 \leq k \leq 6.77$ and $4.642 \leq c \leq 8.301$ for Katsina. The high values of the Weibull parameters ($k \geq 2$ and $c \geq 2$) imply that the data spread in a perfectly normal distribution”</p> <p>Please check the claim again and make the necessary changes.</p> <p>The paper topic is good one and author have the chance to extend the study for different regions too across the world.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Navjot Singh Sandhu
Department, University & Country	School of Renewable Energy and Efficiency, National Institute of Technology, India