



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	1. The review in Sec2~6 is not new and clear. The authors could refer to the work: Huan-Liang Tsai, "Generalized model of photovoltaic module using Matlab/SIMULINK," <i>International Journal of Electrical Engineering</i>, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 119-128, April 2010 2. The results in Sec 6.3 is not correct because the temperature in eqs. (6)-(18) is the cell temperature that is the function of weather conditions such as irradiance, ambient temperature, and wind speed. 3. The nomenclature could be listed in order to unify the mathematical symbol and notations.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The PV module in Fig. 3.1 should not be in parallel according to ref. 21. 2. The temperature in Kelvin is K not ° K. 3. The format in references should be unified.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Da-Yeh University, Taiwan