SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJAST_33408**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Brazil market outlook for photovoltaic solar energy**
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	**some improvements are required. It mainly represents a literature review on the implementation of the PVs.** **For example: Numerical values are written in the text, but it is preferable to put them in tables and project them to the future such as to 2050. All figures are taken from other references. It is suggested that all the numerical values should be presented in tables and projected to the future. This will be the novelty of the paper and it would be much clearer for the reader to grasp the content.**	We thank all the suggestions, but we kept the numerical values written along the text and will include in next paper publication.
Minor REVISION comments	**In lines 73 and 74 the solar irradiation is given in kWh/m2. Is it in a day, month or year? Usually, the solar irradiation is measured in W/m2 and if we want to measure it for a day we write it as Wh/m2/day and so on.** **The percent unit in figure 2 is with respect to what?** **Units should be more accurate. For example, when we say GWh, we have to specify if it is per day (GWh/day), per month or per year.** **Some figures are not clear, i.e. figure 3, etc** **It is preferable to make some comparative tables that show the reduction of CO2, fossil fuel, electricity cost, etc during the years if photovoltaic**	We have changed it for /year. The figure description is modified to improve the understanding. Now it's there and gave the explanation. We have changed it for /year. The figure 3 was modified and the text was improved. We thank all the suggestions, whether this analysis do not applied for the paper theme.

	will be implemented versus the case if it is not implemented. **It is recommended to do some comparative studies in tables that show the impact of integrating PVs on the economy of the country.** **Is it possible to propose a solution for each negative impact of integrating PVs? This will be the novelty of the paper.** **Tables that project the numerical values to the future are recommended** **What are the recommendations for the Brazilian government about the integration of the PVs?**	We have proposed a solution for the negative impact and presented in a Table 1. This article presents the situation in Brazil regarding PV generation and in the conclusions are highlighted the points that can facilitate this use, e.g., with investments in technology and professional qualification We thank all the suggestions, but we kept the numerical values written along the text and will include in next paper publication. This topic is showed in 3.1.5 item already mentioning there is a lack of incentives and public policies as well as the photovoltaic industry absence in the country.
Optional/General comments		