SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJAST_13609**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A general review on Photovoltaic, modeling, simulation and economic study to build 100MW power plant in Lebanon**
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	**No, there aren't compulsory revision comments.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. In Abstract section, the word "Using" in line 3 should be written "using". 2. In "Study design" part of Abstract section, the word "Model" in line 1 should be written "model". 3. In "Author's contribution" part of Abstract section, the word "the" in line 1 should be written "The". 4. In "Results" part of Abstract section, the word "is" in line 1 should be written "are". 5. In section 2.3.1 in page 7, the word "Single" in line 119 should be written "single". 6. In section 6.1 in page 15, the word "characteristics" in 335 should be written "characteristic".	Done and corrected
Optional/General comments	In generally, this paper is logical. And there are detailed correct data in the paper. It has novelty for the proposed modeling and economic study.	