

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_83107
Title of the Manuscript:	Elemental composition of Dust Particles and Influence of Dust Addition on Photovoltaic Module Performance
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper presents some tests for the effect of dust deposition on solar photovoltaic unit. Although the paper contains a good bibliography, the results are not really original. The interest could be the 6 samples used for the study, but I think the content is too weak for a publication in this journal. Also, the quality of English is very poor, with unappropriated words in most of the sentence. Such work could be of interest, but perhaps more samples that are representative of the dust present in this region must be considered, and solar photovoltaic units for different providers must be used,. Thus, the paper need a major revision, including strong English improvements.</p> <p>Specific comments: Introduction: - This sentence is unclear: "Yet, an undecorated challenge is fronting this technology during its operation, because of the effect of various sorts of dust materialization"</p> <p>Part 1.1 - Why 1.1 since there is no 1.2 ? - Paragraph 4: Can you specify the country of the "Jazan region"? - Paragraph 7: This sentence is unclear: "... and inconsistency in proficiencies of composite climate". - Paragraph 78: What do you mean by "external resistance"?</p> <p>Part 2: - Change "2.0" to "2."</p> <p>Part 2.1 - What is "Makurdi"? - Can you provide a map of the collection locations? - Figure 2 announced in the text before figure 1. - The legend in figure 2 is difficult to read (the letters are too small).</p> <p>Part 2.2: - How can you be sure that : "No scientific theory in existence proved this homogeneity. But in nature, homogeneity occurs randomly." - End of second paragraph: Why do you report only the average values ? Thus, it is not necessary to present the maximum outputs and equation 1. - Figure 1: It is not a "Schematic Diagram" but a picture.</p> <p>Part 3.2: - The figure 4 is announced before figure 3. - The legends in figure 3 are difficult to read (the letters are too small).</p> <p>Part 3.3: - It is obvious that "the highest maximum power occurred when the panel was not covered with dust." - The legends in Figure 4 are difficult to read (the letters are too small). Also, the content of this figure is difficult to understand; why different volume shapes are used for the green and purple plots? - The discussion in the second paragraph is unclear and confused. - The paragraph "To crown it all, there is a clear reduction in both the maximum power output and efficiency for each test condition if compare to no dust test experiment. This clearly shows that solar PV module with no dust addition gives the highest efficiency during operation as reviewed in previous works." Is a repetition of what is said before. - "To crown it all" must not be used in a scientific paper.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion: - What do you mean by “because solar is growing exponentially”? - What this sentence is at the end of the conclusion means :” If you are using copy-paste option then select ‘match destination formatting’ in paste option OR use ‘paste special’ option and select ‘unformatted Unicode text’ option]”?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jean-Baptiste Renard
Department, University & Country	France