



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12111
Title of the Manuscript:	Power plant driven by residual heat rejected by the bottoming low pressure steam turbines
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	Abstract - The result and importance of the study are not discussed properly. Introduction – The objective(s) of the study is/are not stated. This makes the study to not have proper focus. Results & Discussion - Tables 2 to 4 are not presented in the acceptable format. These should be corrected. References – There are inconsistency in referencing. The authors should follow standard referencing format. Overall comment – The paper is ok if the above corrections could be attended to by the authors.	Abstract has been corrected Introduction has been modified to fulfil the basic requirements reasonably stated by the reviewer Corrected as standard format. A figure has been added to clarify the results References have been corrected to fulfil the standard format Thank you for your valuable suggestions
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		