

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

M. A. Abdelzaher¹

¹ Beni Suef University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The theme is relevant and is a current approach, as it meets the needs. We also appreciate the authors' willingness to readapt some elements of their research. However, in its current form, I recommend **REJECTION** of the work in the current edition of the journal. Among the reasons for this, we list below some observed needs that, once met, can enable a new presentation of the research.

1. The introduction is weak. The motivation for the research is missing.
2. The author should highlight the research objectives of the research in the introduction separately.
3. The manuscript lacks flow. The authors should make more efforts in presenting the work more systematically and clearly. The author(s) have cited old citations throughout the manuscript. The author(s) are also suggested to include references from the latest publications (year 2022). Add these ref. to the intro section:
 - Abdelzaher, M.A. Sustainable development goals for industry, innovation, and infrastructure: demolition waste incorporated with nanoplastic waste enhanced the physicommechanical properties of white cement paste composites. *Appl Nanosci* 13, 5521–5536 (2023).
 - Balboul, B. A., Abdelzaher, M., Hamouda, A. S., & Zaki, A. H. (2019). Nano titania combined with micro silica reinforced limestone cement: physico-mechanical investigation. *Egyptian Journal of Chemistry*, 62(6), 1105-1115.
 - Abdelzaher, M. A., Hamouda, A. S., Ismail, I. M., & El-Sheikh, M. A. (2018). Nano titania reinforced limestone cement: physico-mechanical investigation. *Key engineering materials*, 786, 248-257.
 - Benjeddou, O., Ravindran, G., & Abdelzaher, M. A. (2023). Thermal and Acoustic Features of Lightweight Concrete Based on Marble Wastes and Expanded Perlite Aggregate. *Buildings*, 13(4), 992.
4. English (language, sentence structure, and grammar) needs improvement.
5. The discussion needs to be improvised with theoretical contribution.
6. The conclusion is very weak. It should also be an extrapolation of the key findings from the research and not a summary. So, there should be conclusions around the background theory, data theory/analysis, and key outcomes. The authors should have included the following sub-sections within the conclusion section with more details:
 - Implications to theory and practice should be clearly stated;

- Key lessons learnt;
- Limitations of this research;

Good Luck