SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJAST_19129**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparison of empirical models for estimation the monthly global solar radiation**
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)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Title better reads ''**Comparison of empirical models for the estimation of monthly solar radiation at Nigde in Turkey** " ABSTRACT **Methodology:** remove ''**According to our results, all the models fitted the data adequately and can be used to estimate the specific monthly solar radiation**'' **Conclusion:** replace with **'According to our results, all the models fitted the data adequately and can be used to estimate the specific monthly solar radiation**'' 1. INTRODUCTION ..... In places where no measured values are ~~**not**~~ available..... 4. CONCLUSION Given the small differences between the variance explained by exponent regression and the most accurate equation?	**All correction have been made**
Optional/General comments	It is a well organized and explained study and result findings.	