

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ARJOM_118015
Title of the Manuscript:	Persistent Homology in Solar Production
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript has the potential to be important for the scientific community for novel application of persistent homology, potential impact on renewable energy research and contribution to the convergence of topology and time series analysis</p> <p>Yes, but You can make it more concise as follows: "Topological Analysis of Solar Power Time Series" or "Persistent Homology in Solar Energy Patterns"</p> <p>You need to state explicitly your main findings or results and summarize the impact or its implications</p> <p>The subsections should follow these patterns: Introduction, Literature review, Preliminary, Methodology, Results, Discussion/conclusion</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references provided are not up to date, you can visit the below website for the recent citations https://ourworldindata.org/renewable-energy</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is okay for the Publication</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Abdullahi Isyaku
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Animal Health and Production Technology Ibadan, Nigeria