SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



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 \underline{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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The title of the manuscript is deceptive since the manuscript deals with the review of Flue Gas treatment unit for packaged gasoline generators. No invention was developed by the author(s). The literature review is hardly linked to the topic since the contents only covers a review/assessment of Flue Gas treatment Unit. From the author's write up, the methodology stated is not meant to analyse any objective. There is no data to be analysed, therefore, the analytical tools are not useful and therefore rendered the conclusion invalid. The work is not scientifically robust. From the methodology, the work only describes a research proposal intended to carry out at a later date with the analytical tools stated since the analytical tools were not employed for any data analysis. The only basis for continuation is for the author(s) to rephrase the topic, rewrite the entire manuscript as a literature survey of Flue Gas treatment unit for packaged gasoline generators.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The topic should be rephrased and methodology strongly revised.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nigeria