



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_ACSj_3475
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Global Solar Energy Potential at Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA) Permanent Site Afaka Kaduna, Nigeria

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Abstract The authors start their article with three monthly measurements of solar irradiation but suggest conclusions for exactly the particular days and time in the months. IF they mean these three months then the work is not complete, otherwise the suggestion is not valid. They should have at least 1-year (12-month) solar irradiation data. Introduction The first paragraph provides general Information and the remaining part of the article does not touch on the solar energy critical literature review and finally there is not aim of the article except the use of solar energy for military purposes. The use for military does not provide any sueriority for the solar energy works. Research Area This section does not provide any text except the figure, which does not mean anything to the reader. Methodology	Authors' comment: These three months chosen are the period of maximum sun shine within the region, and the information obtained will establish solar irradiation data which then form a baseline for any planned application of solar irradiation in the study area. Authors' comment: Literature update on solar energy has been provided now, and the objectives of the paper fully captured towards the end of the introduction. Authors' comment: A readable text has now been added to support the geographical map of the area already presented in the article.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	This section does not include method or methodology, but it is about instrumentation and measurements leading to data for use in the article. Authors' comment: This section reports the procedures used for data collection and treatment as well as the instruments employed, and can therefore be regarded as methodology in line with international standard. Data treatment There is nothing new in this section. The equations starting from number 2 need proper referencing. Authors' comment: It is literarily acceptable to employ an existing data treatment procedure in carrying out a novel research. Thus, the concept has been employed to execute a study on the subject that has not been specifically studied for the chosen location. References to all the equations have now been provided. Results and Discussion This section includes tables and graphs, which are classical presentation tools. It would have been better if the authors could use another methodology and show the superiority of the Hargreaves method. There is no error criterion whether the data matches the measurements and therefore, the application of Hargreaves method is based only on the subjective preference	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Authors' comment: Since the method employed for the presentation of the results does not violate any international standard, it is literarily and scientifically valid. The key desired information is to present the results and discuss them logically, with all details being clear. This has been clearly illustrated in this section.

Conclusions

There is no mention about the methodology and its suitability for the study area. The principle advantage of the method used is based on the quality of the data only. Besides, as mentioned earlier 3-month data is not sufficient for conclusive decision.

The authors are advised to augment their measurements to cover at least 12-month data and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	revise their conclusions accordingly.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I appreciate the work of the authors in a country where there is not much solar energy data. However, it would be very supportive if they wait for several more months and obtain 12-month data and revise their work.	