



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN: 2320-5407

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55137

Title: From Policy to Practice- Barriers to Solar Energy Development in Nepal: A Systematic Literature Review

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

1. General Comments

This manuscript presents a comprehensive systematic review of barriers to solar energy development in Nepal, covering literature from 2010–2024. It successfully integrates policy, institutional, economic, technical, and social dimensions in the context of Nepal's evolving governance system and imminent LDC graduation. The use of PRISMA 2020, SPIDER, and MMAT frameworks strengthens the methodological rigor. The analysis is rich with data, tables, and temporal/geographical breakdowns, and the findings are highly relevant to policy makers, energy planners, and researchers. However, the manuscript is very long, with certain sections (especially Methods and Results) containing extensive detail that may overwhelm readers. The writing is generally strong, but clarity and conciseness could be improved. Despite the depth of analysis, the paper occasionally reads as descriptive rather than critically evaluative.

2. Content and Originality

Strengths

- First systematic review offering a complete categorization of barriers in Nepal's solar energy context.
- Strong temporal and geographical analysis—rare in regional energy reviews.
- The link between Nepal's federal restructuring, LDC graduation timeline, and energy policy is original and insightful.
- Large dataset (89 studies) strengthens the reliability of synthesized findings.

Weaknesses

- Some barrier categories are standard and well-known globally; originality lies mostly in the Nepal-context synthesis.
- Discussion could better highlight *new insights* derived from the review (e.g., barrier interactions, causal patterns, missing policy linkages).
- The conceptual contributions (e.g., model or framework) remain largely descriptive rather than theoretical.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Technical Quality

Strengths

- Adherence to PRISMA 2020 standards, structured methodology, robust search strategy.
- Use of MMAT for quality assessment is appropriate and enhances credibility.
- Quantitative analysis (chi-square, confidence intervals) is well presented.

Areas for Improvement

- The PRISMA flow diagram is mentioned but not fully integrated with correct figure numbering and formatting.
- Some tables are too dense and could be simplified for ease of interpretation.
- The Results section includes both results and partial discussion—these should be clearly separated.
- The statistical methods beyond chi-square (if any) should be stated more explicitly.

4. Language and Presentation

Strengths

- Academic tone appropriate for a peer-reviewed journal.
- Clear explanation of methodological processes.
- Good use of transitional phrases and structured argumentation.

Issues

- Occasional complex or lengthy sentences reduce readability.
- Minor grammatical inconsistencies ("noteciable", "approaching to LDC graduation").
- Paragraphs often include too many facts without summarizing the main point.
- A few verb tense inconsistencies—use past tense consistently for methodological descriptions.
- Figures (e.g., Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 3) are referenced but not formatted properly in the text.

5. Structure and Organization

Strengths

- Logical flow from introduction → methods → results → discussion → conclusions.
- Barrier categorization is systematic and well-organized.
- Use of tables enhances understanding of prevalence trends.

Weaknesses

- Methods section is too extended and could be streamlined.
- Some repetition across Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusions regarding Nepal's LDC graduation and solar potential.
- The Discussion section should more explicitly compare findings with global evidence.
- Policy implications should be grouped into a dedicated subsection to improve clarity.

6. References and Citations

Strengths

- References are extensive (over 100 sources) and cover peer-reviewed, institutional, and gray literature.
- Sources are relevant and up-to-date, including 2023–2024 literature.

Areas Needing Improvement

- Citation style is inconsistent (mix of APA-like formatting and numeric line breaks).
- Some URLs are excessively long and need DOI formatting.
- A few references appear outdated relative to the 2010–2024 inclusion criteria, though relevant (e.g., pre-2010 studies).
- Ensure all references are alphabetically ordered and formatted consistently according to journal guidelines.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Some entries lack full publication details (page numbers, volume/issue).

7. Overall Recommendation

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Justification:

The manuscript is well-researched, methodologically sound, and highly relevant, but requires Minor revisions in structure, clarity, figure integration, and reference formatting. The analysis is strong but needs more critical synthesis and trimming of redundant content. With revisions, it holds strong potential for publication in a reputable energy policy or sustainability journal.

Final Decision: Minor Revision Required

The paper has strong empirical rigor and rich insights, but improvements in presentation, organization, and critical synthesis are needed before it can be accepted for publication.