



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_23996
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF PENSTOCK CONFIGURATION ON THE PERFORMANCE OF A SIMPLIFIED PICO-HYDRO SYSTEM
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article is interesting and results are also new. <i>Authors are required to write/ Change:</i> Introduction: Gap of work need to be explained in brief in the Abstract and in details in the Introduction sections; whether such pico- hydrosystem were tested in earlier researches or not? Conclusion <i>It is to be written point wise and comparative outcome if such systems were tested in earlier researches.</i>	THE ABSTRACT WAS UPDATED BY ADDING THE HIGHLIGHTED PORTIONS. WE HAVE NOT FOUND ANY DIRECTLY SIMILAR PICO HYDRO SYSTEMS TO COPARE WITH MINE BUT WE HAVE TRIED TO COMPARE OR AT LEAST RELATE OUR FINDINGS WITH THOSE FROM CONVENTIONAL SYSTEMS. CONCLUSION RE-WRITTEN AS REQUIRED
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Article is considered to be good for publication with above minor revisions as suggested.	