

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.	Solar energy is the best renewable energy. Research in this field will definitely beneficial for whole world as well as for mother earth. I like the manuscript because it suggests a good technique which is cost effective and the components used in this technique are available in any laboratory.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Development of an Indoor Line Scanning System for Photovoltaic Modules	
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.	Yes, abstract is comprehensive. Abstract can be revised as it is lengthy.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	I think in the introduction, in the first paragraph there should be introduction of solar energy and research on that and then in the second paragraph there should be need of research. In Result section more scientific explanation is needed. This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as they have done experimental study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rashmi Praveen Galphade
Department, University & Country	B. K. Birla college of Arts, Commerce and Science (Autonomous), India