

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_115032
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of PVsyst and RETScreen simulations for a grid-connected photovoltaic system
Type of the Article	

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. The article is an exciting article for scientific community and it helps designers in the field of renewable energy, to select and use best one between the selected alternatives. 2. If the title be like this would be nicer “ A comparative study of two common software’s used for Photovoltaic systems, RETscreen and PVsyst 3. The abstract has some grammatical mistakes and punctuation problems, like NIGER, Niger and the author said “the aim of the study was” needs a review again 4. The structure and is fine 5. Yeah its correct but needs urgent review and improvement. 6. References has to be linked with the places that has been cited in text, for better clarification and better understanding of the references, so that	 OKAY OKAY NOTED
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. It needs to be reviewed and improved, particularly its grammar and punctuations.	 OKAY
Optional/General comments	 1. The fonts are not accurate for titles and text and all are same 2. The abbreviations are not explained 3. Inverter name and company are not known 4. PV company is not known 5. The results seems to be written as suggestion for how to write a result and discussion and seem it has been written by an AI tool, for example “Results should be.. 6. How MBE introduced 7. Fig 1 hasn’t been explained well 8. Tables are not well structured, if the design be changed 9. In conclusion the datas are only written but there is not a proof of the taken data from both softwares that has been taken after simulation.	 OKAY

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	