

Editor Comments

In my opinion this article need to be improved .

Table 1.1, 1.2, 3.3, and 3.4 - limit the number to 3 significant digits. Why this kind of numeration for tables?

Fig. 1.2 is unclear (and rotated?). Who is the author of this picture? What is the source?

Table 3.4 and fig. 3.3 presents the same data. Author should choose - table or figure, not both.

Tab. 3.5 - Maybe it's better to present some results in MJ/day?

All equations from results and discussion section should be moved to methodology.

In results and discussion section there is no discussion.

Stylistically and editorially the work is poor.

Author's Feedback

Corrected