

Review of: "Technical and Financial Viability of a 1 MW CSP Power Plant with Organic Rankine Module: Case Study for a Northeastern Brazilian City"

Amir Abedanzadeh¹

¹ University of Tehran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor

This paper does not meet the decent quality and requirements of a novel research and should be rejected in my idea.

Manuscript Title: "Technical and Financial Viability of a 1 MW CSP Power Plant with Organic Rankine Module: Case Study for a Northeastern Brazilian City"

The points of concern are as follows:

1. The novelty is poor.
2. Figure. 1 is related to years 2010 to 2018! It needs to update.
3. The parameters used in the formulas should be explained instantly after the formula.
4. In part 2.3. "Thermal Energy Storage (TES)", it is said "Since the heat losses for the HTF were accounted for in the solar field, heat losses associated with TES were considered to be too small (0 kW/K) as in [17]." Is it logical? It is more rational to calculate the TES losses.
5. Authors need to update the survey of literature for more recent papers specifically published in the recent years 2023 etc.
6. The lack of paper schematic is evident. It is required to give a bird eye view picture of your finding.
7. In some cases, there are writing errors.
8. The article did not have line numbers!
9. What does this sentence "when the incident radiation reaches values close to 15MW" mean?
10. Exist the simulation done for a year; why are the results illustrated in fig. 2 for one day?
11. Does "solar multiples" mean concentration ratio (CR)?
12. In Fig. 6 how are the "CO₂ Avoided [ton]" and "People attended" columns are calculated? There is no elucidation in the body.
13. What are the dimensions of numbers in page 21? (0.46 and 0.3)
14. What important matter do you want to communicate with Figs. 6 and 7?

15. What does “e” stands for in “MWhe”?

Regards