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

Silvio Simani[1]

1 University of Ferrara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Message to the Authors: In the reviewer's opinion, the paper could have been more interesting and organized better. In general, the overall contribution remains scientifically poor and technically questionable. In more detail, the paper's title is quite clear, whilst its Abstract should have avoided using technical terms and acronyms, which reduce its readability. The keyword list needs to be improved. Section I does not provide a sufficiently accurate overview and critical discussion of the state of the art of the related literature. As a minor remark, the end of Section I should have summarised the general structure of the manuscript by briefly listing the contents of its sections. Section II should have suggested more details regarding the considered models and tools, especially regarding the uncertainty, disturbance, and model-reality mismatch. In fact, this point is fundamental when the proposed solutions have to be applied to safety-critical processes. Moreover, Section II should have helped the reader understand the proposed methodology's effectiveness. In particular, it does not consider the reliability and robustness aspects of the proposed algorithms. Due to the remarked flaws, the achieved results analyzed in Section III do not highlight the effectiveness of the proposed solutions, especially concerning the robustness and reliability features of the developed methods, considering the unavoidable presence of uncertainty and disturbance effects, as well as the model-reality issue. The authors reported several pictures; however, more effective metrics and performance indices should have been considered for assessing the effectiveness of the developed schemes. Finally, Section IV does not suggest effective open problems and future issues that could require further investigations. On the other hand, the use of acronyms and technical terms should have been avoided also here, as it should remain a stand-alone part of the manuscript.

Message to the Editor. In the reviewer's opinion, the paper could have been more interesting and organized better. In general, the overall contribution remains scientifically poor and technically questionable. Therefore, in the reviewer's opinion, the manuscript should not be considered for publication due to extremely limited contents and added values.