

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127691
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF POWER AVAILABILITY IN WIND FOR A SIEZABBLE WIND TURBINE IN AKWA IBOM STATE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY, IKOT AKPADEN
Type of the 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 '**Jack 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. The evaluation of wind resource potential for sustainable energy development in the Akwa Ibom State University Community is a crucial study topic that is covered in this publication. It offers insightful information on the wind energy profile in the area, draws attention to problems with obstructions like trees and buildings, and suggests workable ways to improve energy capture. The work advances the more general objective of encouraging renewable energy, which is crucial for meeting the world's energy needs, maintaining environmental sustainability, and reducing the effects of climate change.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	1. Assessment of Wind Energy Potential for Small-Scale Turbine Deployment at Akwa Ibom State University, Ikot Akpaden.	
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.	1. The abstract is comprehensive and outlines the study's objectives, methods, results, and implications. However, there are minor issues with language clarity and grammar. For instance, "sensitivity to sighting wind turbine" could be rephrased as "suitability for siting wind turbines," and "results shows" should be corrected to "results show" 2. Additionally, the abstract should include a numerical response, such as the percentage that you truly enhanced by creating this system.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	1. The manuscript is scientifically sound, using established wind energy analysis methods and empirical data. However, some explanations, like power law equations, require more detailed derivations or references.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. Research gap is not clear, what do you want to do in your paper and why? 2. You have to add a good table for literature review from previous studies. 3. Clearly mention your research goal. It should be more specific, not a general sentence. 4. The references are mostly adequate, but several are dated or less specific to the region of study. Incorporating more recent and regionally relevant studies would strengthen the manuscript. Suggested additions include recent works on wind energy assessments in West Africa or similar regions to provide comparative insights.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although the manuscript's English is comprehensible, it needs to be edited for style, grammar, and punctuation to satisfy academic standards. Particular areas that require development consist of: 1. fixing typos (for example, "results shows" → "results show"). 2. ensuring that technical words are used consistently (for example, "sensitivity to siting" rather than "sensitivity to sighting"). 3. enhancing the clarity and conciseness of sentences.	
Optional/General comments	About Results: Practical results can be compared with the simulation software (MATLAB) to be more accurate and how different wind patterns can affect overall power output. Moreover, simulation results can be compared to practical results and may help to optimize the system further.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asish Kumar Akash
Department, University & Country	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh