



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10958
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of Electrical Power Demand of Bayelsa State (Nigeria) by year 2025 Using Improved Estimate Method
Type of the Article	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	A well-known concept of predicting electrical power consumption based on linear regression is attempted by the author(s). While the lack of novelty is not an issue, the paper is poorly written with unprofessional structure and style. Among other inadequencies, the following comments are note-worthy: 1. Section 1 is normally expected to be a documentation of literature review of the existing knowledge on the subject of electrical power consumption, possibly comparision global energy consumption trend with that of Nigeria/Bayelsa state; review of existing electrical power consumption prediction models; the presentation of the implication of adequate forecasting model for Bayelsa state; and the statement of the focus of the present study. However, the author(s) presented a single paragraph section between line 21 and 26. This presentation is inadequate for a journal paper of any standard. 2. Sections 1-4 are not worth a stand-alone section of a journal paper; and each on the contents is shallow and unacceptable. 3. The derivations of a well-known numerical methods like least square method and lagrange interpolation, second-order polynomial, exponential function, etc, are irrelevant as a research article. 4. The evaluation of one of the predictor variables (Year) with a value of the 4-digit number of year is confusing. Although this evaluation will not necessarily affect the expected progression in years, there is no evidence that this confusing does not negatively affect the forecasting of the electrical power consumption in the year 2025. 5. The one-predictor variable correlation between Power and	Introduction has been significantly modified to highlight previous works in this area. Adequate addition material has been added to this section. They were initially mistakenly deleted. Sections 1-4 have been improved and up-graded. Standard derivations are relevant to the average reader to enable him understand the mathematical formulation. All equations and matrixes have now been corrected. This is standard practice in load prediction methods. It does not negatively affect results. Other variables a_0, a_1, a_2, which are population



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Year (which is a function of the population) cannot provide a reliable prediction of electrical power consumption, even in a top-down model, as presented by the author(s). Other variables, like weather, etc, have been established to be significant in the modelling of energy consumption. 6. The conclusion(s) of the author(s) are unjustifiable. Without proper validation, the assertion on the accuracy of their Second-Order Polynomial model based on best-fit is misleading. Their results should be properly validated before such assertion can be justified. The materials in the manuscripts are almost 90% published materials on well-known subjects relating to topics, like linear regression, curve fitting and interpolation. Yet, the author(s) merely listed references at the end of the manuscript without relevant citations throughout the sections. Although the materials in the manuscript are not necessarily plagiarized, the presentation of uncited materials for journal publication is unprofessional.	growth rate, effect of temperature (weather) and price of electricity respectively were considered (see pages 8, 9 eqns 23, 24 and 25). Results were validated by comparing computed values with actual ones. Using the 2nd order polynomial method, in 2009 the actual demand value is 42.62MW while the computed predicted value was 43.21MW. In 2010 the actual value is 4.51MW while the computed predicted demand is 48.15MW. All references listed have been cited in the paper. Other references not cited have been deleted. All references used have been cited.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		