

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	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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The author has used wind energy as a potential source of energy for Akwa Ibom State University. This can be a potential source of study for many studies in future. This study can be used as a base for all future scientists, trying to work in the field of renewable energy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title covers all aspects of the study including wind energy, its potential and the future use in making turbines	
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 is comprehensive and needs no reform.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The author has done a very good quantitative analysis to suggest the use of wind energy to make sizable wind turbines. There is no glitch in the calculations done.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is apt but needs minimal rectification which has been highlighted in red colour in the manuscript. A slight change in the verb 'used to' from 'use to' and it is highlighted in red colour.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author can suggest some recommendations also for future research in this field.	

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:	Neeraj Kumar
Department, University & Country	Veer Madho Singh Bhandari Uttarakhand Technical University, India