



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_29910
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Losses in Distribution Networks of Selected Industrial Cities in Nigeria using ETAP
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 word faces should be removed in introduction. -Figure 2 quality is poor, please improve on the quality -ETAP view of the Port Harcourt and Kano distribution should be included -In methodology, the number of networks written in numeric and bracketed is not important. Writing the numbers in words is enough. -All equations must be numbered -numbering of equations must be aligned -the flow chart in figure 3 is not clear	We are grateful to our highly esteemed reviewer for painstakingly going through our work and making these crucial comments towards its improvement. We are happy to inform that we have carefully effected revisions as suggested. We have also highlighted in yellow the parts where we made corrections in the manuscript. The details of what we did are as follows: 1. We have removed the word <i>faces</i> in the Introduction section and modified the sentence as appropriate (See pg. 1, para. 2, line 1). 2. We have zoomed Figure 2 and improved its quality. 3. We have included the ETAP view of the Port Harcourt and Kano distribution as instructed (See Figs. 3 and 4). 4. We have deleted the number of networks written in numeric and bracketed as instructed. 5. We have numbered all the equations as instructed. 6. We have aligned numbering of equations as instructed. 7. We have zoomed and placed the flow chart in figure 3 now figure 5 on two separate pages of the manuscript and hope that this has made the flow chart clearer (See pgs. 9 and 10).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		