

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2379
Title of the Manuscript:	Electricity as an Energy Vector: A Performance Comparison with Hydrogen and Biodiesel in Italy
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I liked this manuscript because it presents an important study comparing Electricity, Hydrogen and Biodiesel as energy vectors to power an aluminium smelter. The authors take into account factors such as cost, land area and energy efficiency to classify the various possibilities of using Electricity, Hydrogen gas and biodiesel as the main energy source to power the aluminium smelter, from which they conclude that Electricity has the best cost-benefit ratio.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I believe this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it carefully describes in great detail the experimental procedures used to collect data on the performance of each of the power vectors when powering the aluminium smelter and to efficiently reduce these data to conclude the best cost-benefit ratio for the Electricity vector.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes, in general. However, the authors should review the Reference format that is not fully in line with the journal's Author Guidelines. For example: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript may be accepted for publication as a book chapter after the minor revision in the References is done.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daniel Lima Nascimento
Department, University & Country	University of Brasilia, Brazil