

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_126855
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of an Indoor Line Scanning System for Photovoltaic Modules Performance characterization
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript offers a cost-effective method for evaluating the performance of photovoltaic (PV) modules, particularly in settings where resources are limited, such as in Uganda. The development of an indoor line scanning system using locally available materials addresses a significant gap in affordable PV testing. This approach contributes to understanding solar cell mismatches, a crucial factor affecting PV efficiency. Overall, this work enhances the knowledge base on PV performance assessment, especially in regions with growing solar energy adoption.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract requires including a brief mention of the potential implications for improving PV technology in developing countries. Adding a sentence on how these findings can contribute to better quality control in PV module manufacturing would also strengthen the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and overall structure are appropriately organized. However, adding a dedicated subsection for "Related Work" or "Background" may strengthen the foundation and provide context for the chosen approach.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically sound as it employs rigorous experimental methods to assess PV module performance both indoors (via line scanning) and outdoors. The use of precise measurements such as photogenerated currents and the application of standard industry procedures for I-V characterization ensures the reliability of the findings. The study also identifies and explains critical factors like solar cell mismatch and manufacturing inconsistencies that affect module efficiency, making the manuscript technically robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that should be addressed. I recommend revising sentences for conciseness and ensuring consistent use of technical terminology. A thorough proofreading would help in polishing the language to meet the standards expected for scholarly publications.	
Optional/General comments	the paper need more in-depth comparison of the results with previous studies.	

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:	Mohammed Qasim Taha
Department, University & Country	University of Anbar, Iraq