



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_53973
Title of the Manuscript:	Techno-Economic Analysis of Hybrid PV-Diesel-Battery Mini-Grid in Rural Bangladesh
Type of the 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:

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



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The quality of Figures from 1 to 6 is poor. The quality of figures from 7 to 10 is very poor. The axis titles is not clear. References are needed in the introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. paragraph starts from "According to IDCOL" ended to " 20 kW capacities each" 2. paragraph starts from "At present" and ended " in the country" <p>In the introduction, the author should add a literature review about the subject. At least the author(s) should review 10 articles. The articles should be very close to the subject of the article. The author should compare his/her participation with already published papers.</p> <p>The author should provide clear explanation about the research gap and purpose of the study in the introduction. The novelty factor should be stressed in a clear way.</p> <p>Add further discussion on the results.</p> <p>Add a figure to load profile (power with respect to the time of the day). Add a figure to solar radiation instead of table.</p> <p>The author(s) is highly depending on internet references. This weakens the paper. Try to replace them (if possible) with more rigid references.</p> <p>In general, The references are not compatible</p> <p>Improve the following references: 1, 2, 4, 5, 15, 42. They are not eligible.</p> <p>The conclusion should summarize the most important results of the article. So the author is required to rewrite the WHOLE conclusion as the current conclusion summarizes the whole article without concentrating on the main findings. [The current conclusion is NOT ACCEPTED]</p> <p>THE FINAL EVALUATION WILL PROCEED AFTER PERFORMING THE REQUESTED REVISIONS.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Add 'Optimization' in the Keyword</p> <p>Please use USD or US\$ instead of \$</p> <p>assumptions and conditions for the study are not fully described.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author talks in details about the energy situation in Bangladesh which is fine. The author adds tables and data in the introduction. It is preferable to add figures; it is more illustrative.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Aysar M. Yasin
Department, University & Country	An-Najah National University, Palestinian