EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
16 YEARS

Paper: **"Design and Implementation of a Detection and Diagnostic System for Anomalies in a Grid-Connected Photovoltaic System"**

Submitted: 13 January 2026
Accepted: 24 February 2026
Published: 28 February 2026

Corresponding Author: Aristide Mankiti Fati

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n6p33

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Salloom A. Al-Juboori
Applied Science Private University, Jordan

Reviewer 2: Shefqet Meda
Canadian Institute of Technology, Albania

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026*

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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Eng. Shefqet Meda	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology/Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.01.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.01.2026
Manuscript Title: Design and Implementation of a Detection and Diagnostic System for Anomalies in a Grid-Connected Photovoltaic System	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0164/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: 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.	**5**

Yes. The title accurately reflects the paper's focus on the design and implementation of a detection and diagnostic system for anomalies in a grid-connected PV system.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	**3**
Partially. The abstract clearly states the objectives and methods but lacks concrete, quantitative results. It mentions that the Lambert W model "accurately reproduces the electrical behavior" but does not provide measurable outcomes, key performance metrics (e.g., detection accuracy, RMSE values, performance improvement).	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Yes. There are some minor grammatical and formatting issues, such as, inconsistent section numbering (e.g., III.1.2 followed by III.3.1.2.1, mixed language in references (French terms in English paper), typos: e.g., "Caracteristique" (Figure 11), "Lambert" sometimes with/without hyphen.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Yes. The methodology is well-structured, covering: PV system structure, fault classification, diagnostic methods (infrared, reflectometry, I–V analysis), modeling (single-diode, two-diode, Lambert W), simulation approach.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
Partially. The results are presented graphically with I–V and P–V curves, and RMSE values are given. However, there is **no tabulated summary** of results for different fault scenarios, the link between simulation results and real-world application is not strongly demonstrated and some figures are mislabeled or duplicated (e.g., two "Figure 5"s).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Yes. The conclusion accurately summarizes the study's aim, methodology, and implied value. However, it would be stronger if it included **specific quantitative findings** from the results section.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Yes. The references cover recent and relevant sources in PV fault detection, including conference papers, theses, and journal articles. However, some citations appear to be from non-academic or commercial sources (e.g., guide websites).	

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):

The paper is well-structured and technically sound but would benefit from: adding quantitative outcomes to the abstract and conclusion, including a system workflow/diagram, presenting results in summary tables, grammar correcting and formatting.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: