

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

Dieter Boer¹

¹ Universitat Rovira I Virgili Tarragona

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors, find below my remarks with the intention to increase readability and impact.

Comments:

1. Be sure to include all used abbreviations in the nomenclatures section.
2. Figure: You use often too small characters. For numbers apply separators of thousand.
3. Why are you choosing a power of 1 MWe. Wouldn't it be economically more efficient to consider larger power, in order to reduce the specific cost of components? So, please justify this choice.
4. Why are you separating section 2 and 3, both could be resumed as methodology.
5. "Sun irradiation data acquired ..": Comment for which angle
6. ORC: Which working fluid is used?
7. Do you suppose that ORC efficiency is constant?
8. Which type of TES system are you considering?
9. "solidification temperature of 142 .." Missing symbol
10. Include a figure of your system with the different components.
11. Also include for some typical operation conditions representative results (T, p, mass flows, energy flows, component efficiencies) in order to help other researchers to reproduce your results. This can be placed in an appendix.
12. Include SM in abbreviation list. How do you define solar multiple.
13. Table 6: Increase character size. No more than 4 significant numbers.
14. Fig. 6, 7: Don't include numbers after decimal separator.