



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	No, there aren't compulsory revision comments.	
<u>Minor</u> 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".	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Beijing Information Technology Institute, China