



**Renewable Energy Sources - Research and Business (RESRB)**



**Sustainable Solutions for Growth (SSG)**



**Journal of Renewable Energy Sources - Technology, Business and Policy (JRESTBP)**

## Reviewer guidelines

### **Purpose of manuscript review**

Reviewer evaluates strengths and weaknesses of manuscript's ideas and content. Based on this evaluation Reviewer provides constructive suggestions for the authors explaining how to improve the professional quality of the manuscript.

### **Reviewer's potential major criticisms of the manuscript**

Use the Manuscript review form to present your review comments. Below are some major areas of criticism to consider in your review report:

#### **SIGNIFICANCE, NOVELTY, PROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

Is the information in the manuscript novel and original?

Is the objective of the manuscript important for the field?

Is the manuscript timely?

Is the research problem significant?

Does the research make a significant contribution to the advancement of human knowledge, theory, or practice?

What are the social, political, technological, business implications of this research?

Does the research produce any practical applications?

Are there any errors of fact and interpretation?

How the findings relate to other literature on this topic?

#### **TITLE**

Is the title of the article appropriate and clear?

What does the title lead you to expect about the article? Does it precisely and adequately state the subject of the paper? Is it fully consistent with the manuscript content?

Could the title be improved and how?

#### **ABSTRACT**

Does the abstract accurately summarise the manuscript?

Is the abstract specific and in the correct form?

Does the abstract give a summary of the author's arguments.

Does the abstract provide the most important concluding remark?

What is missing in the abstract?

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Check the sequence of statements in the introduction. Does all the information lead coherently to the purpose of the study?

Does the authors synthesise the pertinent literature relevant to the purpose of their work? Suggest missing references.

## METHODS

Is the methodology clearly explained?

Are the experimental methods described adequately?

Are the methods valid for studying the problem?

Could the study be duplicated from the methods given?

What is missing in the methods?

Check the methods for flaws. Is the experimental design sound? Are calculations correct?

What software or technology is used, what alternative methodological resources could be used?

What is quality of the author's data and evidence? Are sources professional? Are data and evidence appropriate and sufficient? Suggest new sources, data and evidence.

Does the paper provide an original and more significant than minor contribution to the literature - either through improved methodology, a more refined analysis or both?

## RESULTS

Review the results in light of the stated objectives. Does the study reveal what the researcher intended?

How does the authors support the hypothesis?

Are the findings presented and described clearly and fully? If not, what is missing?

Examine carefully the resulting data as presented in the tables and figures. Does the title or legend accurately describe the content? Are column headings and labels accurate? Are the data organised for ready comparison and interpretation? (A table should be self-explanatory, with a title that accurately and concisely describes content and column headings that accurately describe information in the cells.)

Review the results as presented in the text while referring to the data in the tables and figures. Does the text complement, and not merely repeat, data?

Check all calculations and presentation of data. What should be added?

Are the results and data analysis convincing?

## DISCUSSION

Check the interpretation against the results. Does the discussion complement or merely repeat the results?

Does the interpretation arise logically from the data? If not explain how this can be improved.

Have the faults/flaws/shortcomings of the research been addressed?

Is the interpretation supported by other research cited in the study?

Have any ideas been overemphasised or underemphasised? Give examples.

Has the author been objective in his or her discussion of the topic?

Could the data be interpreted in another way? Explain how.

## CONCLUSIONS

What are the authors' central conclusions? Are they clearly stated? Are they supported by evidence and analysis?

Do all conclusions derive from the manuscript body?

Are you convinced by the author's concluding remarks? Why or why not?

Suggest missing concluding remarks?

## REFERENCES

Have the authors cited the pertinent, and only the pertinent, literature?

Are the references recent? Do they represent important work in the field?

Suggest missing references.

#### MISSING CONTENT

Is there any missing content (new theoretical background, data, new research, new figures/tables, new discussion, new conclusions, new references) that would improve the professional quality of the manuscript?

Provide your suggestions to be implemented by the authors. Give references when necessary.

#### EXCESSIVE CONTENT

Does the paper contain material that could be omitted?

Is all the material required to achieve the scientific goal of the paper?

Which part of the material brings to the attention of readers topics of minor importance for the main scientific goal of the study?

#### STRUCTURE

Is the article organised logically and easy to follow?

Check the structure of the manuscript (first headings and then paragraphing). Is all the material organised under the appropriate headings? Are sections divided logically into subsections or paragraphs?

Does the article contain all of the components you would expect (Introduction, Methods, Theory, Analysis, Conclusions, etc.)?

Should some sections of the manuscript be expanded, condensed or omitted? Are the sections well-developed?

If the paper relates to policy - are the policy implications of the work clearly presented in the section titled Policy Implications?

#### STYLE

Is the article well-written and easy to understand?

Are stylistic concerns, logic and clarity well addressed?

Who is the intended audience? Does the style used match the intended audience?

Are the author's statements clear? Challenge ambiguous statements. Suggest by examples how clarity can be achieved.

Does the author define important terms?

Is the information in the manuscript well-researched or is it unsupported?

Is the article lacking information or argumentation that you expected to find?

Is the author's language objective or charged with emotion and bias?

#### ENGLISH

Is English free of errors? Check grammar, vocabulary etc.

#### FIGURES, TABLES

Are all figures readable? Do they have sufficient graphical quality?

Are figures and tables sufficiently well explained in the text?

If illustrations or charts are used, are they effective in presenting intended information?