#### **SDI Review Form 1.6**

#### SCIENCEDOMAIN international



www.sciencedomain.org

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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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**

## SCIENCEDOMAIN international

SCIENCEDOMAIN

www.sciencedomain.org

## **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed
	Reviewer 5 comment	with reviewer, correct the
		manuscript and highlight that
		part in the manuscript. It is
		mandatory that authors should
		write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION	This paper finds the effect of distributor plate configuration on pressure drop in a	write may her jeeubuck herej
comments	bubbling fluidized bed reactor. Although the work is worthy for literature, still lots	
Comments	of work have done on it. Different configurations of distributor plates and bed	
	particles have used to study the bed pressure drop. I suggest the following major	
	and minor revisions of the manuscript.	
	<b>1</b> . Line 16: The authors comments that a decrease in angle of convex and increase in angle	
	of concave resulted in a decreased pressure drop. This statement is contradicting	
	according to figure.7. Which makes me quite confusing. Which one is true?	
	<b>2.</b> In figure.1, F-Conical Inlet section is not included in the figure From which part the	
	sand particles are fed to the reactor. Show it in the figure.1	
	<b>3.</b> The authors have not specified the type of pitch used for the distributor plates .I am	
	afraid to read that yours total open area of holes is only 1.63% of bed cross-sectional area.	
	Please the results may re-examine.	
	<b>4.</b> How you controlled the moisture content of the air, it has significant effect on the bed	
	pressure drop. U have written a filter (line 199) is used for supplying dust and moisture	
	free air. What is the mechanism behind the moisture control in the filter used in your	
	experimentation?	
	<b>5.</b> If the pressure drop is decreasing from concave to convex, what would be optimum	
	angle for the plate for minimum pressure drop? If possible, Please add a simulation work.	
	<b>6.</b> All the equations are quite not readable, seems to be like copied. Please use equation	
	editor to rewrite the equations.	
	7. I suggest to remove the figure.12 from conclusion section to results and discussion	
	section.	
	<b>8.</b> I suggest to provide the photocopy of yours experimental set up and distributor plates	
	in the manuscript. This will improve clarity to the readers.	
	<b>9.</b> Line 177: lengths of 127.5, 255.0, 382.5mm (0.5, 10, 1.5 D) respectively. Whether it is	
	10D or 1D.Clariffy.	
	<b>10</b> . Line 185: Sides were inclined at 30 0 from vertical. It should be 30°.	

## **SDI Review Form 1.6**

## SCIENCEDOMAIN international



www.sciencedomain.org

	<ul> <li>11. Line 205: This was connected to a I 00mm long vertical pipe. It should be 100mm. Am I right.</li> <li>12. Line 237: I 0 mm diameter. I think it should be 10mm. Please correct it throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>13. Please rephrase the line 346: The 0° convex and 10°</li> <li>14. Rephrase the line372: Velocity of 1.75 U<sub>mf</sub>.</li> <li>15. How the authors predicted that, the fluidization type is of bubbling one. Will you please justify me? The type of fluidization depends on the Reynolds number through the bed. The authors nowhere found the Reynolds number through the bed.</li> </ul>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol> <li>Line 539: please rephrase according to your experimental results.</li> <li>The manuscript contains large number of spelling error. I request the authors to go through the manuscript seriously. All the words should be separated and clear to be readable.</li> </ol>	
Optional/General comments	Fluidization is very old from research point of view. Still your work has some importance to the literature. I suggest to the authors to make the major and minor changes.	

# **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, India