

Reviewer Evaluation Form

Part 1: Paper Data (By conference TC)

Paper ID	230		
Paper Title	TECHNO-ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY PROSPECTIVE ALONG THE LIBYAN COAST		
Conference Track [Topic]			
Paper Category	Research:	Review:	Outlook:

Part 2: Manuscript Evaluation (by reviewer)

Manuscript Evaluation.		YES	NO
Mark YES or NO by V and add comments in the Part3 if you are not satisfied.			
1	The paper presents new results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	The title is clear and adequate to the purpose of the study. Propose another if not satisfied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Abstract clearly presents problem statement, objects, methods, and results. Provide comments to author if not satisfied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Scientific methods are adequately used. Provide comments to author if not satisfied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Terminology is adequate. Advise the authors by suggestion if not satisfied	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Results are clearly presented and well discussed. If not, provide comments to authors, please.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Conclusion is logically derived from the data presented.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Keywords are adequate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Supplements (tables, charts, pictures, and drawings) are clearly presented. Provide comments to author if not satisfied.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	References are appropriate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Quality Classification of the Work (mark by v)

1	Exceptional work: makes a major contribution to the advancement of the subject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Good quality work: significant, novel, interesting, and influential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	Borderline work: correct but of low interest, unlikely to have an impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4	Low quality work: adding little or no new knowledge to the field	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Poor work: not free from basic errors and/or faulty judgments	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part 3: Detailed Comments/Recommendations to the Author(s).

Provide least of 10 comments and suggestions to the authors to improve the quality of paper, please

1. The Authors must use more method for investigation
2. The Authors must use portable lab to measure wind speed for more than one season
3. Authors must use the calculation of wind power for height more than 50 m



Overall Reviewer Decision by reviewer

1	Acceptable for publication without changes.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Acceptable for publication after minor revisions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	Acceptable for publication after major revisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Reject.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reviewer Information (by conference TC)

Full Name	Proof Dr Iyd Eqqab Maree	
Academic Degree	Proof	
Affiliation, including country	University of sahadin college of Engineering Head of Aviation Engineering Deapartment	
Email	iyd.maree@su.edu.krd	
Date of Review		