

Review of: "Water-Energy Nexus in Power Systems: A Review"

Ashkan Makhsoos¹

¹ Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper effectively synthesizes a range of research to examine the intertwined relationship between water and energy in power systems, emphasizing its importance in sustainable energy planning. Here are some specific comments.

Structure and Organization: The paper's structure appears disjointed, lacking a clear narrative that logically connects different sections. A more cohesive structure, with a logical flow from introduction to conclusion, would enhance the paper's effectiveness.

Depth of Analysis: While the paper covers a range of topics, it often does so superficially. There's a need for deeper analysis, especially in interpreting the implications of the reviewed studies. A more critical examination of the methodologies and findings of the referenced works would add depth.

Originality and Novelty: The paper primarily reiterates known information and lacks novel insights or unique contributions to the field. To improve, it should identify and fill gaps in existing research or offer new perspectives on the water-energy nexus.

Data Visualization and Use of Examples: The lack of visual aids like charts or diagrams makes it difficult to grasp complex concepts. Additionally, real-world examples or case studies to illustrate key points are missing, which could otherwise make the paper more engaging and practical.

Policy and Practical Implications: Although the paper touches upon policy and regulatory aspects, it fails to deeply analyze or critique these elements. A more thorough exploration of the implications of current policies and suggestions for practical applications would be beneficial.

Conclusions and Future Directions: The conclusions drawn are generic and do not effectively synthesize the paper's findings. The paper would benefit from a more robust conclusion that summarizes key insights and suggests specific directions for future research.

Language and Clarity: The paper suffers from language inconsistencies and grammatical errors, detracting from its overall clarity and professionalism. Rigorous proofreading and editing are needed.

Literature Review Methodology: The methodology for selecting and reviewing the literature is not well articulated, raising questions about the comprehensiveness and bias in the selection of sources.

Overall, while the paper tackles an important topic, its value is undermined by structural weaknesses, lack of depth, and missed opportunities for original contributions. A more critical approach, better organization, and an in-depth analysis could significantly enhance its quality and relevance.