SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_PSIJ_25255**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Energy Management Optimizing in Energy Hub with Regard to Pollution and Storage Effects**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper deals with cost and emission reductions of an energy hub with a storage unit for energy saving. The costs and pollution rates are calculated according to the weighting factor. Although the research is interesting, the article requires substantial improvements in order to make it acceptable. 1) The sentences need to be formulated in correct English. Please revise the whole manuscript. 2) The battery is not indicated in fig. 1 which represents the system. 3) Relation (15): please define M_{max}. 4) Relation (16): t varies from 1 to 24. Authors should indicate that the time step is of one hour. 5) Relation (17): α, β and γ should be defined in section 3.5 and not in section 3.6.	

6) Relation (20): please explain the significance and notation of "RAND".

7) Section 4: the context of the simulation (day, temperature, atmospheric conditions, pollution, characteristics of devices…) has to be given with the main data of the model and their origins (for example values of constants a, b, c, α, β ,γ etc.).

8) Fig. 2: there is almost no difference for gas prices between cost and cost+saver, and also between emission and emission+saver. Ditto for table 1, with or without storage unit. The interest of integrating storage seems to be limited. Please provide an analysis regarding those results.

9) Fig 3: the relations which are used for the graph must be indicated within the text of section 4.1.

10) Please make it clear in figures and tables whether it is the "variation of W" or "W". Also "the objective functions" have to be distinctly identified.

SDI Review Form 1.6

	11) Please conclude with optimized values for W. It seems to be of 0.55 for fig. 4.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Paris 12 Val de Marne University, France**