



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_3682
Title of the Manuscript:	Smart Grid Technologies: A Risk Management Framework

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	The paper by Habash, Krewski and Paoli addresses critical issues of the smart grid primarily in terms of information and communication technologies (ICTs), standards, security threats, and possible health effects. My expertise is in health effects; as such, my review focused on this aspect of the manuscript. <u>Section 6.1 Smart Meters:</u> the review of the health effects of possible exposure to RF is very sparse. The authors should either build a much larger review into their paper (and there are countless articles from the primary literature that can be reviewed) or clearly state at the outset that the information provided is simply a very brief overview of the issue, with a focus on government limits of acceptability. <u>Section 6.1 Smart Meters:</u> While the authors acknowledge electromagnetic hypersensitivity (incorrectly referred to as electrical hypersensitivity in the manuscript), they do not mention that the WHO/IARC considers RF EMF as a class 2B possible human carcinogen. This needs to be discussed. <u>Section 6.2 Wind Turbines:</u> the review of the health effects and wind turbines is even sparser than in Section 6.1. To date, there are roughly 50 articles in the primary literature dealing with this topic. There does not appear to be a reason for the selection of the articles referenced. The authors need to state why these articles were	Agree with the reviewer! Section 6 has been revised (see text in RED). Few more references have been added. Section 6 has been named as "mini-review" for clarification as suggested by the reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	selected. If the intention of the authors is to provide a brief overview of the issue, I suggest they stick with topic review articles; they did cited Knopper and Ollson but should look other primary literature reviews and those from government and medical agencies from around the world. For example: Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit, 2008; Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council, 2010; Australian Government, 2011 and 2012; Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH), 2012. The Minnesota department of Commerce (2011) has an excellent review about global distance and noise setbacks. <u>Section 6.2 Wind Turbines (lines 365-367)</u>: The sentence “As a result, minimum setback distances have been established world-wide to reduce or avoid potential effects for people living in proximity to wind turbines” is a DIRECT quote from Knopper and Ollson (2011). If a direct quote is used please reference the original source.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		