

Interactive comment on “Optimal Site Selection for Sittinga Solar Park using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis and Geographical Information Systems (GIS)” by Andreas Georgiou and Dimitrios Skarlatos

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 2 May 2016

Revision for Optimal Site Selection for Sitting a Solar Park using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) A. Georgiou & D. Skarlatos

This is a quite attention-grabbing contribution that would definitely be interesting for practitioners in the field. The paper presents a fair compromise of scientific curiosity and technical applicability. A number of articles that deal with the issue of sitting renewable energy projects by using GIS and MCDA are also successfully presented. First think I would, therefore, suggest to the authors is to explicitly state where their work differs from the other similar works in the field that they cite. By those means the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



reader would easily identify the added value of this work.

The list of references is adequate. The English, though, should be checked again throughout the whole text.

The Introduction presents some rather trivial issues like the plus and minus of solar and PV power, etc. I would suggest that the authors provide for a shorter introduction to their paper that will focus mainly on what they have done.

I would suggest that Chapter 2 'Materials and methods' would start with Figure 3 that presents the methodological framework developed. Then, an explanation of the several steps adopted should be realized. Subsequently in Chapter 3 'Case-study' the application of the framework should unfold.

Figure 4 is not very instructive; it cannot be read. The authors may want to replace it or delete it.

In Table 2 there is no point in having a column Normalization if this is the same for all criteria.

In section 3.3 the term 'cost function' should be explained.

A number of 'cases' are explained and properly introduced in section 4.1 sensitivity analysis, even though the authors refer to these cases earlier in text for example line 262. The authors may want to correct this inconsistency.

Chapter 4 starts with text that it is not numbered. I suggest that all sections are numbered.

In Figure 6 the right down part presents some type of distribution that is not explained nor can be read.

A number of other comments follow: Line 9: Please replace dependable with reliable
Line 25: Please replace summation rule with weighted summation rule
Line 30: Please explain what is GUI?
Line 36: Please put security of supply
Lines 43-46: Please rewrite

sentence with better English Line 67: Expression like sustainable development used here are too general postulations and add limited value to the paper Line 238: Please explain what these distance cost functions' are Line 241: Same as previous comment Line 262: Please first introduce the what so called 'cases' and then use them in text Line 267: The term mild technical criteria may not be appropriate here Line 288: What about the rest of the criteria? Line 303: Which are these tools of integrated site evaluation? Line 317: The authors may want to revise this statement since there are plenty of earlier works that have utilized this type of modelling and overall methodology for renewable and PV in particular project siting.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gi-2016-4, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

