

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

Mahalakshmi Ganapathée

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

First, I would like to acknowledge the efforts taken in writing this manuscript.

After going through the manuscript, I found, a detailed comparison between the classic Perturb and Observe P.O algorithm and another intelligent based on the fuzzy algorithm is conducted to assess MPPT accuracy. The findings demonstrate that the proposed model is characterized by simplicity and the capability to simulate diverse operating conditions.

I should definitely mention here about the missing content of the authors contribution in the manuscript. Kindly gives the comparison of the proposed system result with values from the plot obtained. The conclusion needs to be improved in much better manner. Kindly write a future scope of your work in a separate section to provide a better leading for the readers.

According to my perspective, I would like to convey those point below which need to be implemented to make the paper worth for publication as it might help many new researches as a good guide. In my opinion, this article should be published after amendment of few parts leading to improvisation.

1. In the manuscript kindly draw a block diagram explaining the topology to give clear view easily.
2. Even though you have a separate section for result validation I insist you to include the data pointing a specific value from the graph, which will guide the readers properly.
3. Kindly avoid explaining about the basic methods in detail, as they have been already be explained enough in texts.
4. A discussion on Future Scope and an insight on the further developments could be pointed out.
5. Overall, the paper should be redrafted by giving focus to what actually is the contribution of your work in particular after comparing it to the most of the available techniques and its merits over those. The problem statement and the objectives of the research to be stated with more clarity.

1	Relevance to the scope of Journal	Yes
2	Originality	Yes
3	Engineering/scientific relevance	Yes
4	Completeness of the reported work	Acceptable with the above given corrections
5	Adequacy of acknowledgment of the past related work by others, in the reference list	Need to be improved
6	Organization and composition of the manuscript, which must have:	
	a) Definition of the objective	Need to be improved
	b) Justification of the objective	Need to be improved
	c) Accomplishment of the objective	Yes
	d) Description of the method of the study	Need to be improved
	e) Clear presentation and discussion of the results	Need to be improved
	f) Validation of the results	Need to be improved
	g) Comparison to the results by others	Need to be improved
	h) Concise conclusions/recommendations	Must be improved
	i) Clarity and good expression in English, and of tables and illustrations	Need to be improved
	j) Appropriate length	Acceptable.