



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	

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- There are some mistakes and difficult to understand constructions too. English language must be reviewed along the abstract and the whole manuscript. - Introduction and state of the art are quite complete and clear but Authors must avoid using literal text extraction from references unless they cited them (using inverted commas). It could be considered plagiarism, so it must be reviewed. - In section 3.1 IECC model is explained. Rejected heat is calculated between stages 4 and 1, so it is not consistent with energy balance in section 2.1 where q_0 is calculated between stages 5 and 6. - Equation 10 is not consistent as specific heat or enthalpy (kJ/kg) is equalled to power (kW). For this reason mw should be dimensionless in equation 11. The same comments apply to equations 12 and 13.	- The English language has been reviewed along the abstract and the whole manuscript - Your observation is absolutely correct. However, many common expressions used in the introduction have been also used previously by hundreds of authors since many (non cited) authors are dealing with about the same general concepts regarding the use of residual heat. Thus in order to focus the researched topic a couple of references has been considered. Nevertheless we are sure that thousands of authors that have proposed partially similar concepts (<i>using efficiently residual heat from low pressure turbines</i>) have not been cited but in general authors dealing with residual heat applied on ORCs and researching on Carnot based thermal engines. - Your observation is write. When considering regenerative IECCs there are 6 state points. However for a non regenerative IECC, which is the analysed case, then, only four state points are considered. The corresponding figure and text has been corrected. - Equations 10, 11, 12 and 13 have been corrected accordingly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Tables 2, 3, and 4 could be clearer using a header. Table captions neither are clear. • Capital letter "W" is used to represent specific work. It would be more consistent to use a lowercase letter as for "q", "u", "h"... • In section 2.2 valves status is explained. Valves "A", "B", "C" used within the text are not labelled in figure 4. Table 2 is also confusing when explaining valves status. I recommend to give more information in table 2 and to refer to figure 4 diagrams.	• Tables headers and label numbers corrected accordingly. • Capital letter "W" is used to represent specific work has been changed by a lower case letter. • Corrected as suggested Thank you for your valuable help on improving the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		