



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_47564
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF WEEKLY DISCHARGE RATE OF TWO SOLAR BATTERIES COMMONLY USED IN ANAMBRA STATE
Type of the Article	Research Paper

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> The abstract should be concise and BRIEF. It must state the purpose of the study, the main results and conclusions. ➤ Suggestion: Omitting the first part of the abstract from the beginning [<i>Presently...</i>] to [<i>...and promote the use of this sustainable renewable source of energy in the country.</i>]</p> <p><b>Introduction &amp; Background of the study:</b> The two sections seem to reproduce the same ideas. A re-structure must be considered. ➤ Suggestions: 1- Merging the two sections into one. 2- The new section must gather the previous works that treated the same subject, explains the motivation to do the work, and presents the contribution. 3- Considering the integration of the part omitted from the abstract.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> <b>Design methodology for Stand-Alone PV Security light.</b> It was mentioned that [<i>...The design involves calculating the values of different components</i>]. Which values other than those listed in the section "Materials" had to be calculated? 1- If the values to be calculated are those mentioned in the section "Materials", the sections "Materials" and "Design methodology" should be switched. Because in this case, the output of the "Design methodology" would be presented in the section "Materials" 2- If other values were the focus of the calculation, they should be specified explicitly in the section. In both cases, the design methodology was not well explained. How did the authors calculate the values? The steps of the design methodology must be cited in detail to justify the choice of the values selected for the system.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussions:</b> The data was measured, stored and collected. How? What were the hardware and software tools that were used in this data acquisition process? This crucial part was neglected in the paper. The paper shows an experimental study, presenting the data acquisition process would be beneficial for both the authors and the research community.  No synthesis or comments were given for the eight figures. Explore the significance of the results drawn in the figures.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Results and Discussions:</b> In the first paragraph, three similar expressions were used: "<i>the output voltage</i>", "<i>the average of the output voltage</i>", "<i>output average voltage discharge rate</i>". Are those expressions refer to the same parameter? If yes, consider using only one expression all along the paper to not create a confusion for the reader. If not, explain the difference: which one was extracted as it is, and which one is the result of a calculation?</p> <p>The first paragraph indicates: [<i>The data were collected from 19.00hrs to 7.00hrs...</i>] and later [<i>The output voltages of Indian made battery and Chinese made battery were recorded for each hour of the day...</i>]. Was the data collected/recorded for each hour of the day, or for only the hours cited earlier?</p> <p>The tables show the results of a parameter called "HR AVE". This abbreviation stands for a parameter that was not defined in the paper.</p> <p>"Tripped off", "off", "Tripped": use one expression if meaning the same. Otherwise, provide</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>an explanation of the difference.</p> <p>Citing the countries that manufacture the subject of the comparison: Chinese battery and Indian battery. Would not be better if only the technical characteristics are kept?</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Enrich the conclusion with some numerical findings extracted from the study.</p>	

**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:	<b>Chaimaa Essayeh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Morocco</b>