

ReviewForm

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126673
Title of the Manuscript:	A state-of-the-art Review on vortex induced vibrations phenomenon Bladeless Wind Turbine Technology
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article does not include any aspect of a state-of-the-art review, focusing solely on the introduction of the turbine without blades model and the phenomenon of Vortex-Induced Vibrations (VIV). The absence of references to studies discussing technological and scientific advancements in the development of turbines without blades limits the contextualization of the work with current research. Additionally, the references used in the text are predominantly outdated, with only one reference from the year 2023, which further diminishes the article's relevance and comprehensiveness. Furthermore, the article only mentions a model developed by a Spanish company, without exploring other significant contributions from the academic literature. The figures presented in the article are of low quality, compromising the clarity and understanding of the data and results. Screenshots from PowerPoint presentations and PDFs are used inadequately, resulting in images that are difficult to read and uninformative. The figure captions are simplistic and do not provide sufficient information for readers to fully comprehend the visual content without consulting the main text. These aspects negatively impact the overall quality of the article and its relevance to the scientific community, hindering the dissemination and application of the knowledge presented.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not suitable, as it is extremely confusing. Initially, it suggests that the article will provide a state-of-the-art review of the Vortex-Induced Vibration (VIV) phenomenon, but later shifts focus to bladeless turbines. The title should be reorganized to clearly reflect the main topic of the article. If the focus is solely on turbines, there is no need to include the VIV aspect in the title. A potential alternative title could be "A State of the Art Review on Bladeless Wind Turbine Technology."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I appreciated the abstract of the article; however, I believe that in a future version, it should include more information about the results obtained from the review towards the end of the abstract. Including these details would encourage readers to continue reading the article by providing a clearer insight into the key findings and contributions of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction was too brief and did not adequately introduce the topic that the article intends to cover. Instead of providing an overview of bladeless turbines or the VIV phenomenon, it only analyzed wind energy worldwide, with little mention of the turbines being studied. Additionally, the section reviewing the VIV phenomenon and bladeless turbines could be integrated into the introduction, as it merely explains what the phenomenon is and how the turbine functions. This integration would make the introduction more complete and informative, better preparing the reader for the content of the article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It looked like a textbook, as it only explained the phenomenon as everyone already knows and did not introduce articles or hold a discussion on the state of the art of these bladeless turbines. And the fact of using old references did not bring anything new to the text that helps the reader to identify what has been studied in these turbines and the gaps that exist to be filled.	

Review Form

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>It has a structure more akin to a textbook, merely explaining the phenomenon in a basic manner, as it is already widely understood, without introducing relevant articles or discussing the state of the art of bladeless turbines. Furthermore, the use of outdated references failed to bring any new insights to the text that could help readers identify recent studies on these turbines or the existing gaps that need to be addressed.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The grammatical part of English has an adapted level that allows understanding of what is being said here during the text.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The idea of creating an article on the state of the art of this type of turbine is extremely interesting, as it represents a generation option that offers many benefits. However, the author needs to conduct a more comprehensive review. It is necessary to seek recent articles that cover all the developments in these turbines, discuss the findings of these studies, and, as a possible conclusion, identify the gaps that still need to be addressed in the advancement of this technology. Additionally, the author needs to improve 100% of the figures and their respective captions. The figures used in the text should be able to tell the story of the article on their own, without requiring the reader to fully read the text.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramiro De Matos Bertolina
Department, University & Country	University of Brasilia, Brasil