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The authors of this paper want to thank the editor and reviewers for critiquing the paper. We hope that the following edits based on the review reports improved the paper to the standards of MDPI. The paper has been thoroughly proofread with the reviewers’ comments in black font while the responses of the authors are in blue.

Edits in the paper follow the standard form of:

Edited sentence. ~~Unedited sentence.~~ [x] Author comment. [Reviewer Number, Comment Number]

**Reviewer #1:**

**Report Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language and Style | ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  ( ) Moderate English changes required  (x) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  ( ) I don’t feel qualified to judge about the English language and stye | | | | |
|  | | Yes | Can be improved | Must be improved | Not applicable |
| Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the research design, questions, hypotheses, and methods clearly stated? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced, and compelling? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| For empirical research are the results clearly presented? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | (x) |
| Is the article adequately referenced? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |

**Comments to the Author**

1. It is not clear how the pinch point issue in the recuperators was dealt with. Eps-NTU method can capture this only if heat exchanger is divided into multiple calculation domains as cp varies significantly. From the resulting efficiencies I would concur that pinch point was taken into account as the results appears to be correct. However, for the less educated reader it might be misleading. Please improve the description of sCO2 cycle recuperators modelling.

Edits done for clarity of approach temperature to the sentence in the third paragraph of Section 2.1.2. The sentences ‘The temperatures of the hot and cold flows on either side of the the heat exchanger have a temperature difference known as an approach temperature.’ was changed to ‘The smallest temperature difference of the hot and cold flows on either the low or high end of the heat exchanger is defined as the approach temperature of the counter-flow heat exchanger.’ Additional explanation of the capacitance ratios explained in the last paragraph of section 2.1.2 with the sentence ‘Specific heat is found using library correlations.’ Changed to two sentences with a source ‘Specific heat is found using library correlations, with the average capacitance rate assumed to be constant during the analysis. Assuming constant average capacitance rate is suitable for most engineering purposes, especially when there is uncertainty associated with other parameters [25].’

1. Check if sentence on the line 446-447 is correct. It does not make a sense to me.

This sentence seems to be correct except for the additional conjuncture ‘and’ that was overlooked in the proofreading. This sentence has been corrected to ‘Cycles that do not contain the listed component omit the associated values.’ and can be found at lines \*

**Reviewer #2:**

**Report Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language and Style | ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  ( ) Moderate English changes required  (x) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  ( ) I don’t feel qualified to judge about the English language and stye | | | | |
|  | | Yes | Can be improved | Must be improved | Not applicable |
| Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic? | | ( ) | (x) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the research design, questions, hypotheses, and methods clearly stated? | | ( ) | ( ) | (x) | ( ) |
| Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced, and compelling? | | ( ) | (x) | ( ) | ( ) |
| For empirical research are the results clearly presented? | | ( ) | (x) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Is the article adequately referenced? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | (x) |
| Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |

**Comments to the Author**

This paper discusses different configurations to couple lead fast reactor and concentrating solar power through supercritical carbon dioxide cycles to improve efficiency and reduce cost. In general, this work is well written, but the authors are suggested to consider the following comments when revise the manuscript:

1. In the abstract, “Nuclear reactors, including lead-cooled fast reactors (LFRs), can load follow, but have high fixed and low operating costs which can make this economically unattractive.” This sentence needs to be revised.

Revised this sentence for readability to ‘Nuclear reactors, including lead-cooled fast reactors (LFRs), can adjust power output according to demand, but with high fixed costs and low operating costs this is economically unattractive.’ Changing ‘load following’ to ‘adjust power output according to demand’ reduces the requirement of knowing what ‘load following’ is. Additionally changing ‘high fixed’ to ‘high fixed costs’ distinguishes the two discussed costs from each other increasing readability.

1. Page 2, “Utilizing complementary technologies, specifically solar concentrating power and lead-cooled fast reactors, can offset the drawbacks of each”. Can authors explain in more detail what are the drawbacks of LFR and CSP?

Additional explanation of drawbacks added after this sentence. The supplementary sentence reads ‘These drawbacks include CSP dependency on weather conditions and time of day, while the LFR has a large system inertia on start-up and ramping while reducing strain on system components when consistently operating.’

1. Page 5, “Restricting the lead ﬂow velocity, and therefore lead mass ﬂow rate, leads to a higher LFR power output when the inlet sCO2 temperature is reduced.” The logic behind this sentence is unclear.

Edited the sentence to exemplify that reducing the lead flow rate in the LFR while reducing the sCO2 inlet temperature increases the power output of the LFR. This sentence is important when explaining the benefits of decreasing the sCO2 inlet temperature in the parametric studies. The new sentence reads ‘Restricting the lead flow velocity, and therefore lead mass flow rate, while lowering the inlet sCO2 temperature increases the temperature difference across the LFR HX allowing for a higher, more desirable, LFR power output.’

1. Page 7, “As grid demand diminishes, CSP HX ramps down heat extraction until no power is being dispatched through the salt and the hot TES begins charging. During this process, the LFR gradually adds a larger fraction of heat input to the TES through C2S. This process continues until no electrical production is occurring in the cycle and all heat is stored in TES for later use.” Why cannot we keep using CSP to charge hot TES when grid demand diminishes?

This sentence was edited for clarity, the cycle uses the CSP to charge the hot TES when grid demand diminishes. The sentence ‘As grid demand diminishes, CSP HX ramps down heat extraction until no power is being dispatched through the salt and the hot TES begins charging.’ was elaborated on to be ‘As grid demand diminishes, electrical generation is ramped down by decreasing heat input through the CSP HX. This continues until no heat is being dispatched from the solar salt to the sCO2, and all produced thermal energy from the CSP is put into charging the hot TES.’

1. Page 7, Table 1, P2A, T1A, T5, T2C, T6A, T5C need to be explained.

A supplementary sentence was added to explain the variable names in Table 1. The sentence reads ‘In Table 1, variable names require further explanation. The high side pressure with the variable label P2A, is the constant pressure outlet on the compressors and inlet to the turbines. In all models the value is set by the outlet of the main compressor and held constant with the assumption that there is no pressure drop across heat exchangers. In addition to this pressure, temperatures are also set. The inlet temperature of the main compressor, T1A, is set to a value of 40oC in all models. The temperature of the sCO2 on the outlet of the LFR HX has different variable names, T5, T2C, T6A, and T5C, according to the associated cycle configuration diagram.’

**Reviewer #3:**

**Report Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language and Style | ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  ( ) Moderate English changes required  ( ) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  (x) I don’t feel qualified to judge about the English language and stye | | | | |
|  | | Yes | Can be improved | Must be improved | Not applicable |
| Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the research design, questions, hypotheses, and methods clearly stated? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced, and compelling? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| For empirical research are the results clearly presented? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Is the article adequately referenced? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |

**Comments to the Author**

In this paper, the authors study the possible synergies between CSP and LFR technologies. They compare different configurations of SCO2 cycles with these technologies as heat sources. The topic and conclusions are interesting. Also, the paper is well written, and the methods are correct. I recommend accepting after minor revision.

1. The CSP technology is not clearly explained, and I suppose that is a Solar tower. It is necessary to include some details (efficiency, heliostat area, receiver area) about the CSP.

Introduction was changed to further explain the details of the CSP technology. The sentence before edits read ‘A CSP has an array of mirrors concentrating solar rays towards a receiver to generate thermal energy therefore causing a dependency on weather conditions and time of day.’ After edits this sentence reads ‘A CSP has an array of mirrors concentrating solar rays towards a tower receiver, transferring the energy into a solar salt, and storing the solar salt in tanks. CSP systems require direct sunlight to operate at full power therefore causing variability based on weather conditions and time of day.’ Additional details into the operating temperatures and solar salt with a full diagram of the CSP system is explained further in Section 2.1.4. The efficiency, heliostat area, and receiver area are not within the scope of the paper with the receiver being described as a ‘black box’ heat input, meaning that these specific values are simplified down to a single heat input.

1. It is necessary to include an analysis of the discharging process. When the TES is discharging, the operational conditions of the cycle change, especially the turbine inlet temperature.
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1. The scenario of C-LFR-ON and C-CSP-ON is not a suitable alternative. In this scenario, the two power plants could operate alone. They are reference cases. The configuration with synergies should be compared with them.

Rebuttal: The scenario of C-LFR-ON and C-CSP-ON operating in conjunction is discussed in section 3.1.1 with the final paragraph. Analyzing the separate configuration efficiencies in the prior paragraphs build to an explanation of the two cycles being combined and having ‘combined efficiencies’ which consist of a ‘highest efficiency’ case while the other is a ‘favorable LFR and CSP characteristic’ case.

**Reviewer #4:**

**Report Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language and Style | ( ) Extensive editing of English language and style required  ( ) Moderate English changes required  (x) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required  ( ) I don’t feel qualified to judge about the English language and stye | | | | |
|  | | Yes | Can be improved | Must be improved | Not applicable |
| Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the research design, questions, hypotheses, and methods clearly stated? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced, and compelling? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| For empirical research are the results clearly presented? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Is the article adequately referenced? | | (x) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature? | | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |

**Comments to the Author**

I find your manuscript very interesting and well written. I have just three suggestions:

1. There is a list of abbreviations at the end. You define some of the abbreviations in the text, but definitions of some are missing making it harder to read the text. I suggest you to define all the acronyms the first time they are mentioned in the text. For example: line 27 sCO2, line 40 CSP and TES, line 52 LFR, line 142 EES, line 163 UA and NTU, line 261 PC, line 262 MC, RC.

For clarity, the following abbreviations have been defined after the first time that they are mentioned within the article, if they were defined later in the paper the abbreviation was deleted:

Line \*: supercritical carbon dioxide (sCO2)

Line \*: concentrating solar power (CSP) and thermal energy storage (TES)

Line \*: lead-cooled fast reactor (LFR)

Line \*: Engineering Equation Solver (EES)

Line \*: effectiveness (ε), capacitance ratio (CR), conductivity (UA), and number of transfer units (NTU)

Line \*: precooler (PC), low temperature recuperator (LTR), main compressor (MC), and recompressor (RC)

Line \*: high temperature recuperator (HTR)

Line \*: heat exchanger (HX)

1. In the description of Figure 2, lines 236-263 you also mention the LFR role. Perhaps you could add LFR to Figure 2 and change the subsection title to “Concentrating Solar Power Cycle with Added Lead Fast Reactor” or add a new subsection indicating the addition of LFR.

Rebuttal: Figure 2 is displaying the components of the CSP with cold and hot thermal energy storage, pumps, and receiver. This is a component that is part of the full cycles and is never directly connected to the LFR. This comment is addressed throughout Section 2.3.1 – 2.4.4 with explanations of where the C2S is drawing heat around the cycle. Additionally, the cycle diagrams in these sections display where the CSP HX is positioned.

1. I suppose that all the calculations have been made using EES? Perhaps you could clearly indicate that ate the beginning of Section 3.

Edited a sentence in the Section 3 introduction paragraph to signify that all calculations were made using Engineering Equation Solver. The sentence now reads ‘All calculations were carried out using EES, with the results obtained using standardized values found in Table 2 for a more direct comparison between cycles.’
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