



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 <i>(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)</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	. Author must write about the selected area, e.g., the terrain/topographic features, climatic etc. . I would recommend that cloud cover data should also be used, and if it is not feasible then there must be some reasoning. I would also recommend further revision to improve the manuscript by some English native. As mentioned in line number 168, 169: “For logarithmic model, March, June and July were the months with best performance and February, May and November with the worst. I would recommend the Author/s to explain, Why? Plagiarism Issue: Well, I would say the idea is almost same as done by Mecibah, M. S., Boukelia, T. E., Tahtah, R., & Gairaa, K. (2014). Introducing the best model for estimation the monthly mean daily global solar radiation on a horizontal surface (Case study: Algeria). <i>Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews</i>, 36, 194-202. That is also mentioned by the Author/s. so stricktly speaking it is not the plagiarism but still I doubt about it. May need further insight.	All correction have been made
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	. I wonder, why author use reference [1] so frequently, even it is only based on the case study. Similarly, there are some statements which may need proper references, e.g. Line-30: Based on sunshine records, there are numerous studies have been published	All correction have been made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Which studies?❓ · Line 39: at the end of line may need to write meteorological data instead of only meteorological... · In Table 3, Sunshine duration refers to average annual or what? Please specify. · The Author/s compare 3 empirical models for estimating monthly incoming global solar radiation for the region Nigde, Turkey. These methods have been widely used and considered authentic for the areas where terrain is relatively flat and cloud impact is not significant. Strictly speaking the idea is not new but good for comparative study for a particular region.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I highly recommend to improve the language by native speaker.	All correction have been made