Manuscript: **"Single Versus Combined Forecasting: The Case Of Wind Run Data"**

Corresponding Author: Ismaila A. Bolarinwa

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dr. J. A. Adepoju, Federal Polytechnic Bida, Nigeria

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: Dr. J. A. Adepoju	
University/Country:Federal polytechnic Bida, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received:17/5/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:19/5/2021
Manuscript Title: Single vs Combined forecasting: The case of wind run data.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 73.01.2021(1)	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **Very clear and adequate**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

Yes	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **None**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **Yes**	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **Yes**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) **Yes**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) *Yes and very current*	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a well research work, the author should keep it up