



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_44629
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS of SOLAR RADIATION CHARACTERISTICS by USING INSOLATION MODELS
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>)

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>ABSTRACT: There is need to briefly include the methodology, results and perhaps the contribution to knowledge in the abstract.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: This is unnecessarily too long (almost 6 pages). The literature review should be reduced with the research gap clearly identified.</p> <p>RESULTS: The results of the models should be validated by comparing it with the real values of the solar radiation of the cities.</p>	<p>Abstract is edited.</p> <p>Introduction is shortened.</p> <p>Validation of the model results is explained in the results section.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	There is to discuss explicitly on the methodology and the results.	
Optional/General comments	Satisfactory	

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)	