



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	The authors' states in several paragraphs that they present a thermodynamic cycle that is not limited to the Carnot efficiency of a thermodynamic cycle (e.g. row 309). The cycle that the authors present outperforms the Carnot cycle. This is a result that contradicts standard thermodynamic books in the field such as Cengel and Boles 'Thermodynamics: An engineering approach'. This book tells us that – and I quote - 'The Carnot efficiency is the highest efficiency a heat engine operating between the two thermal energy reservoirs at temperatures TL and TH can have' In light of this, I feel that the authors need to present stronger evidence to back up their statements on the presented cycle. The need to prove without any doubt that it is possible to construct a heat engine that operates between two thermal energy reservoirs and still have a higher efficiency than the Carnot heat engine.	Thank you for your comment regarding the fact of defying the Carnot factor. You understood correctly the meaning of the paper. However the presented thermal cycle is not a Carnot engine, so that cannot be conceptually compared with the Carnot engine. The following description is presented in order to demonstrate the efficiency of the proposed cycle. Thank you for your valuable suggestions
Minor REVISION comments	I suggest that the authors send this paper to proof reading before publishing. The paper could make use a pressure-volume diagram to show the process more clearly.	
Optional/General comments		