



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_AIR_8240
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Distributor Plate Configuration on Pressure Drop in a Bubbling Fluidized Bed Reactor
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Separate “andconical” line 2 (abstract) ... Check in all the words which are undue form joints. This happens in many phrases in the text. - Words are glued to the parenthesis in various parts of the text. Example: diminished (Pavia et al., 2004). Line 33 page 2. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I found the text well-written and complete on the proposed study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil