



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	1. The author started from semiconductor proprieties (Photo-current production, then a comparison of different PV cell technologies, then the fabrication of a PV cell, ...) All this is not needed as we teach it in the semiconductor courses at the diploma level. 2. The modelling section is acceptable but all equations are very badly written. Some of them are really not clear. Also, the author didn't mention which model he has modelled using Matlab, is it the one of single diode or the one of two diodes ! 3. The MPPT algorithm section is very poor as the author presented an only one algorithm. There are at least three know ones so he could present them. 4. All figures are very badly drawn. 5. The economics section is really very hard to understand. 6. Section 8 is talking about advantages and disadvantages !! I really cannot understand how the author is still discussing this issue in 2014. 7. The hybridization section is to be removed as it doesn't have any relationship with this "paper" (This is a class notice from my viewpoint rather than a scientific paper).	Done and corrected Done. And corrected Done, we have developed two methods and mentioned other methods Done and corrected Done and corrected It is removed It is removed and replaced by a section about the Possible implementation of photovoltaic in small countries like Lebanon



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The references list doesn't respect any style/standard and is really very poor. competing interest-: The author started from the semiconductor proprieties to install a farm of 100Mw in Lebanon, I find this very strange.	Corrected The main idea is to construct a PV farm in Lebanon, but some additional information is added just to give the reader a good idea about how to model a PV cell and how it works.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		