



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>                                                             |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JERR_43346                                                                                                           |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Development of Software for Life Cycle Cost Analysis of Solar Photovoltaic (PV) and Diesel Generator Systems in 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) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | The whole paper need to be proofread again carefully.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>The abstract writing can be improved. some minor mistakes.</p> <p>The result shows solar is cost effective, probably can be specific in what way it is cost effective.</p> <p>Fig 1 - should redraw again.very blurry</p> <p>Line 96: probably this sentence need to restructure again</p> <p>Line 123: wrong sentence writing format</p> <p>Line 129: wrong sentence writing format</p> <p>The conclusion doesn't reflects to the objective of the paper. Please look into it again.</p> |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | Generally the paper is well written and well described.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                                                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Ranjit Singh Sarban Singh</b>                                                                                                                              |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Centre for Telecommunication Research &amp; Innovation, Faculty of Electronics and Computer Engineering, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia</b> |