

# Review of: "Socioeconomic Impacts of Hybrid Pico Hydro-Solar Generation System Implementation in Sitio Singawan, Barangay Umiray, Municipality of Dingalan, Aurora, Philippines"

Rachid Zegait<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ziane Achour University of Djelfa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Reviewer:

Comments to the Author

Article Title :

The paper titled "**Socioeconomic Impacts of Hybrid Pico Hydro-Solar Generation System Implementation in Sitio Singawan,Barangay Umiray, Municipality of Dingalan, Aurora,bPhilippines**" presents interesting research that fits the Journal and effectively communicates the primary objective of the research program, which is to address the absence of electricity in the community of Sitio Singawan and improve the livelihoods of the Dumagat constituents through the implementation of the Hybrid Pico Hydro-Solar Generation System. However comments can improve the work

## Reviewer comments

### 1. Title and Abstract:

- The title is somewhat generic and could be more specific about the unique aspects of the research. The abstract lacks clarity on the novelty of the study and doesn't provide sufficient details on the research methods and outcomes. It needs to be revised to offer a more insightful preview of the paper.

### 2. Introduction:

- Change the title of the section "Social impact" to "Introduction"
- The introduction, though providing background, fails to articulate the research gap or clearly state the research question. A more focused and succinct introduction is necessary to engage readers and highlight the significance of the study.

### 3. Methodology:

- The methodology section lacks specificity regarding the benchmark surveys and needs assessments. Details on the tools, sampling methods, and potential biases should be thoroughly addressed. Without this information, the study's

credibility is undermined.

#### 4. **Technology Development:**

- While the description of the Pico Hydro Generation System and Solar Generation System is provided, it lacks the depth needed for a scientific audience. More technical specifications and references to existing literature are required to establish the uniqueness and robustness of the proposed technology.

#### 5. **Results and Implications:**

- The results section, while presenting positive impacts, lacks quantitative data and graphical representation. Detailed tables or figures are necessary to substantiate the claims and enhance the credibility of the study.

#### 6. **Discussion:**

- The discussion is superficial and fails to critically analyze the results in the context of existing literature. A more in-depth discussion, addressing potential limitations and comparing findings with relevant studies, is necessary for a rigorous scientific contribution.

#### 7. **Conclusion:**

- The conclusion does not adequately synthesize the key findings and their implications. It reads more like a summary than a conclusive interpretation of the study's impact. A stronger connection to the research objectives and broader implications is needed.

#### 8. **Language and Clarity:**

- The language is generally clear, but some technical terms need clarification for a broader audience. Additionally, there are grammatical issues and awkward phrasing that need attention.

#### 9. **Figures and Tables:**

- The absence of figures or tables presenting data is a significant drawback. Incorporating visual elements is essential for a more accessible and convincing presentation of results.

#### 10. **Figures and Tables:**

- The absence of figures or tables presenting data is a significant drawback. Incorporating visual elements is essential for a more accessible and convincing presentation of results.

#### 1. **Références:**

- Very few references are included for a scientific article; please add numerous additional references, not less than 30.

#### **Decision:**

- The scientific article, as it stands, **is not publishable in its current form**. It lacks specificity in methodology, technical depth in technology development, quantitative support for results, and a critical discussion. **Major revisions** are required to enhance the paper's scientific rigor, clarity, and contribution to the field. Addressing these concerns could make it a viable contribution to the literature on rural electrification and renewable energy.