



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_12401
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF FLUE GAS TREATMENT UNIT FOR PACKAGED GASOLINE GENERATORS
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The topic considered is very interesting, but the paper has the following deficient:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper lacks focus as there is no objective for the research 2. There is no major contribution from the author(s) as major parts of the paper were directly copied from Reference [1] - Zevenhoven R, Kilpinen - Green House Gases, Ozone – Depleting Gases. 3. Materials & Methods are not logically presented. There is no statistical data to support the analysis. 4. References are not properly cited 	<p>Objective and focus has been restored in paper at the introduction.</p> <p>Direct copy from Reference [1] has been dropped to an acceptable value. the paper has been beefed up by more reliable References.</p> <p>Some logic has been brought into this paper.</p> <p>References have now been properly.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Lines 110 to 221 were copied directly from Reference [1]</p>	<p>These lines have been dropped off the paper.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		