



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_15466
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF STEAM POWER PLANT AT KADUNA REFINING AND PETROCHEMICAL COMPANY FROM EXERGETIC PERSPECTIVE
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- The paragraph in the lines 43 and 44 don't have connexion. Don't write paragraphs with only two sentences. - In the figure 1, include all the components of the plant as you said in the plant analysis. - In the line 211, write the first law complete, with the terms of work and heat. - In the line 224, is necessary to uniform the units because of the units of enthalpy are in kgmol and the entropy units are in kg. Additionally, for the reference state for the water, I don't find the values supplied of enthalpy and entropy in my database for thermodynamics properties. - In the table 3, the total result obtained in the column for the percentage loss, don't sum the number shown. (18.1135). - Is necessary to locate the table 3 after the paragraph of the lines 278 - 283. Equally, is necessary to deepen more in the analysis. - Is necessary to locate the table 3 after the paragraph of the lines 278 - 283. Equally, is necessary to deepen more in the analysis. Is necessary to say why that results are obtained and what implies that. - In conclusions, the first paragraph is only a description of the numeric results. Is necessary to deepen more. There is a lot of aspects about which you can conclude.	- Noted and corrected - No, because all the components are included in figure 2. - Noted and corrected. - Noted and corrected -Noted and corrected. - No because Table 3 is depicting part of the results of the analysis, so it should be in the section of result - Noted and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- the paragraph of the lines 292-295 is more a Recommendation than a conclusion.	- Noted and corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In the line 94, there is a mistake in the presion units. - In the line 210, there is a mistake in writing. (low or law) - In the figure 4, there isn't units on the Y axis.	- Noted and corrected - Noted and corrected - Noted and corrected but the units are stated in the legend of figure 4(Exergy in and exergy out)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		