SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	1) There are a number of grammatical errors and instances of badly worded/constructed sentences. Please check the manuscript and refine the language carefully. 2) In Fig. 1., references should be started with 1. and all rankings should be changed. or This knowledge is general. So, be yourself. Write it yourself. Reference does not write. 3) Fig. 2 should be moved. d) Fig. 3 should be moved. 4) The reference for some formulas should be written. 5) The performance of combined cycle power plants changes according to temp., RH, sea level, (for Brayton cycle), etc. and vacuum, circulation and water temp (for Rankine cycle), etc. In your system, what is the factors affecting performance (advantages or disadvantages)? So, information should be given with a few sentences. 6) References should be re-written according to the Guide for Authors. 7) There are a few typos, each marked in marked copy PDF. Please see the attached marked copy. 7) Paper is interesting. So, there are researches on the	

	subject in literature. The efficiencies are good. There are some trouble points in paper, but paper is enough for the journal. Not: Attached marked copy for authors. Consequently; minor revision is required. Manuscript should re-assessment. Manuscript should be checked. After from corrections, it can be published. Thus, publication may be too late, but will be perfect. I hope these comments will be helpful to you.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Gazi University, Turkey**