

Manuscript: “**Calibration of Ångström-Prescott Coefficients to Estimate Global Solar Radiation in Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 22 January 2021

Accepted: 03 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Maurice Aka Djoman

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p24](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p24)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Yue Cao, Southeast University/ China

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Yue Cao	
University/Country: Southeast University/ China	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021-09-28	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-10-08
Manuscript Title: Calibration of Ångström-Prescott coefficients to estimate global solar radiation in Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Is this investigation conducted by simulation or experiment? It's better to present the detailed method in the title.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The background should be added in the abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The authors should carefully check the grammatical errors to meet the requirements of a journal publication.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It's better to present explanations of symbols in the equations.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It's better to divide the conclusions to three or four parts.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- 1) One more keyword should be added.
- 2) Equation (1) should be removed from the 'Introduction'.
- 3) In the end of 'Introduction', the novelty of this manuscript should be stressed.
- 4) Equation (3) should be put in a separated line.
- 5) Periods of Table 1 are same. Why not delete it and further explain it in the main content.
- 6) Further explanations for the results of Table 3 and 4 should be added.

