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** *(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	**The analysis is elementary and its results are perplexing. No details are given about the process calculation asusmptions. From Table 2, it appears that all the heat exchanging devices have an exergetic efficiency of 100%, which is clearly impossible.** **The Introduction is trivial, and ought to be completely rewritten, joining it with Background and making it more archival (we all know what energy is and how important its final conversion and dispatch are, but this is not the goal of the present analysis).** **Conclusions are not in line with the commonly accepted knowledge of similar analyses.** **The paper looks like a slightly revised version of an internal industrial report, and apparently contains irremediable errors.**	- NO, however, corrections have been effected.
Minor REVISION comments	N/A	
Optional/General comments	N/A	