Review of: "Design of an intelligent controller for improving the solar system efficiency"

Satish Tanavade[1]

1 Caledonian College of Engineering

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer Comments on "Design of an Intelligent Controller for Improving the Solar System Efficiency"

Overall Assessment:
After a thorough review of the manuscript titled "Design of an Intelligent Controller for Improving the Solar System Efficiency," I find that the paper does not meet the necessary standards for publication in its current form. The primary concerns are related to the quality of language and grammar, the organization of content, the depth of technical elaboration, and the clarity of the simulation schemes and comparative analysis.

1. Language and Grammar:
The paper is significantly hindered by its language and grammatical errors. These errors not only make the paper difficult to read but also detract from the credibility of the research. A technical paper should adhere to a high standard of academic writing, which is not met in this submission. It is recommended that the authors seek thorough proofreading and editing to address these issues.

2. Logical Arrangement and Organization:
The logical flow and arrangement of concepts within the paper are disorganized. This lack of structure makes it challenging for readers to follow the progression of ideas and understand the paper's main contributions. A clear and logical structure is fundamental for effectively communicating research findings.

3. Depth of Technical Elaboration:
The manuscript only superficially discusses the key concepts and fails to provide an in-depth analysis of the proposed intelligent controller. For a paper focusing on improving solar system efficiency, a more comprehensive exploration of the underlying technical aspects is expected. This lack of depth leaves the reader with an incomplete understanding of the proposed solution's significance and efficacy.

4. Simulation Schemes and Comparative Analysis:
The paper inadequately explains the simulation schemes employed in the research. Moreover, the comparative analysis of the two Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT) algorithms is poorly executed. Clear and detailed explanations of these elements are crucial for substantiating the research claims and for readers to replicate or build upon the work. The absence of such clarity significantly undermines the paper's technical contribution.

Conclusion:

In light of these concerns, particularly the fundamental issues with language, organization, and technical depth, I recommend the rejection of this paper. The manuscript requires significant revisions to meet the publication standards, particularly in improving the clarity of expression, logical arrangement of content, depth of technical discussion, and the elucidation of simulation schemes and comparative analyses. While the topic is of interest and could potentially contribute to the field, the paper in its current state does not sufficiently advance the understanding of the design of intelligent controllers for solar systems.