



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24603
Title of the Manuscript:	A SIMULATION MODEL FOR ESTIMATING SOLAR RADIATION OF NASARAWA, NASARAWA STATE – NIGERIA
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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper presents an interface which allows to calculate the solar radiation for a located area. Both experimental and calculated results are obtained for the Nasarawa site in Nigeria. The code uses known equations, so the contribution is weak. Moreover, the following main corrections are required. 1) Grammatical and typing mistakes are indicated in red within the manuscript (see attached file named <i>BJAST_24603-Corrections.docx</i>). I might have passed over some. Please check carefully the whole manuscript. 2) Useless or obvious explanations have to be removed, namely lines 104-108 and 118-119. 3) Results in fig. 1 and fig. 3 are shown in fig. 4 and fig. 5 respectively. Hence, Fig. 1 and 3 should be discarded. 4) The measurement instrumentation, methods and exactness have to be described. This would bring a little novelty to the paper. 5) The agreement between experimental and calculated results displayed in fig. 4 and 5 has to be discussed and quantified (discrepancies should be expressed in percentages). Besides, the definition of K_T should be provided in the text.	GRAMMATICAL AND TYPING MISTAKES HANDLED REMOVED AS SUGGESTED FIG 1 AND 3 DISCARDED DONE DONE. DEFINITION OF K_T WAS PROVIDED IN DEFINING THE TREMS IN THE ANGSTROM EQUATION



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6) The results found with statistical tools presented on lines 127-133 have to be depicted. 7) The developed tool should not be limited only to Nasarawa, but could be used to determine solar radiation in other places. It would be interesting to present it as a general tool. This should be mentioned at least in the conclusion.	THEY ARE TOOLS OF VALIDITY THAT CAN BE USED TO VALIDATE RESULTS AND ARE IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN. ANYONE IN DOUBT CAN CHECK. NOTED. INCLUDED IN RECOMMENDATION
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		