

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_40973
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction and Appraisal of solar radiations and its Intensity in South East Geopolitical Region, 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>)

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 is an interesting simulation paper. Before it is acceptable, a minor revision should be done: 1. Figures 13-16 are hard to see. The versions with larger figures should be provided. 2. Some state-of-the-art prediction techniques (e.g., machine learning) regarding to solar energy should be cited and discussed in the paper, including: (2017). Predictive Power of Machine Learning for Optimizing Solar Water Heater Performance: The Potential Application of High-Throughput Screening. International Journal of Photoenergy, 2017. (2017). Performance Prediction and Optimization of Solar Water Heater via a Knowledge-Based Machine Learning Method. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.02511. More background discussions should be provided.	It's is not necessary to add too many reviewed works as suggested by this reviewer in review comment 2. This is a research article not a thesis or dissertation. This reviewer's comment 1 contradicts the other reviewer's comment 1. This reviewer is suggesting a larger figure while the other reviewer is talking of reducing the figure that it's too large. In my own opinion, I think that the figures are okay. There is no need to enlarge more or to reduce more the figures sizes. Thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		