

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_128249
Title of the Manuscript:	THE FUTURE OF SOLAR ENERGY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of solar energy's potential and future in developing countries. By analyzing a vast array of peer-reviewed literature from major scientific databases, it offers valuable insights into the current state and advancements in solar energy technologies. The inclusion of diverse study designs and standardized evaluation instruments ensures a robust and reliable synthesis of data. Additionally, the paper addresses critical challenges and proposes practical solutions, making it a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers, and stakeholders striving for sustainable development through renewable energy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title aligns with the overall paper. I'm satisfied with it.	
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 will be better organized, understandable, and powerful if it includes the following elements: Highlight Key Statistics, Clarify Growth and Potential, Enhance Clarity and Precision, Emphasize Challenges and Solutions, and Conclude with Impact and Future Outlook. The abstract feels overly generalized and standard. However, I think it is fine and appropriate. I suggest reviewing it to improve the language clarity.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a systematic and rigorous methodology, utilizing major scientific databases and standardized evaluation instruments like STROBE and PRISMA. The manuscript also addresses potential biases and limitations, ensuring a thorough and balanced review. By employing a narrative synthesis technique and descriptive statistics, it effectively summarizes and combines the results of various studies. Overall, the manuscript seems to adhere to scientific standards and provides valuable insights into the potential and future of solar energy in developing countries.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The referencing is acceptable, but it must include DOI information for reader validation and convenience. The author must ensure the reference style adheres to the journal's guidelines. Add DOI details to improve the referencing quality.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. It follows a formal tone, uses appropriate technical terminology, and is structured coherently. However, a few minor adjustments for clarity and flow could further enhance readability and precision. Ensuring consistent use of tense and refining sentence structures would contribute to a more polished and professional presentation, making the manuscript even more suitable for academic publication.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript provides a thorough and insightful review of the potential and future of solar energy in developing countries. The use of a wide range of peer-reviewed literature from reputable databases enhances its credibility. The structured methodology, including the use of standardized evaluation instruments and a narrative synthesis approach, ensures a robust analysis. I would suggest adding a flowchart in the methodology section to clearly illustrate the entire workflow. The paper effectively addresses key challenges and proposes practical solutions, making it a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers, and stakeholders. Minor refinements in language and sentence structure could further enhance readability and precision, contributing to a more polished presentation suitable for academic publication. Excellent work!	

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:	Faridul Islam
Department, University & Country	Northbengal Institute of Development Studies, Bangladesh