

Manuscript: **“Proposal Of Optimized Solutions For Joint Use And Hybridization Of Energy Storage Systems And Combined Cycles Or Renewable Energy Plants”**

**Submitted: 28 January 2021**

**Accepted: 04 April 2022**

**Published: 30 April 2022**

Corresponding Author: Rafael Olavarria Rodriguez-Arango

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p56

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Salloom A. Al-Juboori

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

## **Salloom A. Al-Juboori**

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-02-17 04:37 PM

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

**\*yes clear**

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

**\* It's not clear because it has no indication if the proposed system is tried experimentally or by simulation .....**

**So, the abstract must be revised to give a clear picture of the object and the obtained results .....**

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes there are few

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

**\* Clear to about 70%**

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

**\* Not clear, there are no formulas or samples of calculations**

**All the mentioned results and performance in manuscript must be calculated or at least a sample of calculations**

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

**\* NOT clear at all**

**The conclusions must present the major results of research**

**Not to mention, batteries, mainly lithium, and hydrogen fuel cells.....etc**

**Must be completely revised and concentrated on the main findings**

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

**\* Needs updated references, 2021 and more related to the main object of the research**

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**\***

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**\***

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

see the notes on the contents of the paper

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-03-02 12:33 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

**\* No. Title is too general and does not indicate what is really presented in the paper and what type of studies were done. I suggest to rewrite title to be more consistent.**

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\* In my opinion abstract looks like a kind of summary of the works done. It seems that the better approach will be a short description of what was done by author as new in the field presented. Of course, the results also should be presented in the abstract, but shortly and in informative way.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are some typos and grammar but of minor nature. More problematic are long sentences, which sometimes have 8 lines (see paragraph 5th and 6th in the Introduction).

Please carefully analyse the text and rewrite where needed to be more precise. The sentences should be shorter and more informative.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

**\* Yes. The paper is clear in this field.**

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

**\* The body of paper is prepared partially in accordance with ESJ template. The remarks are as follows:**

- the text should be justified,
- Figures 1, 3, 4, 5 should be without frames,
- Figures 6 and 7 are only text - the solution to present them should be different (as text not as figure) and this is mandatory remark for the author. Please present both practical cases as a more clear figure/text or table.
- Figure 5 should be divided on (a) and (b) - this is more proper approach.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\* Not fully - conclusions are too long and most of this section fits better to Introduction. In my opinion Conclusions should start from the phrase "This article describes a new storage system that allows to achieve ....". The earlier part may be used to extend Introduction.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

**\* Partially. It is expected to add 3-4 recent publication from year 2021 related to the paper content.**

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]



\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please carefully read my comments presented in the above points of the review. They includes suggestions/remarks that should be considered when improving the paper. However the idea of the paper understood as approach to solving the problem posed is good and do not arouse the doubts. ONLY sdome general aspects such as Abstract, Introduction and Conclusions should be improved. Then the paper will be very good.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

My suggestions and remarks are written in the distinctive frames. I did not repeat them in the Section "Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)"