



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16778
Title of the Manuscript:	Simulation and Comparison of the performance of refrigerant fluids in single stage vapor compression refrigeration system
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) In the Abstract and also at line 196, the word MATLAB must be appropriately referenced and listed in the References due to the copyright. For example, MATLAB® 2) The reference Dalkilic and Wongwises [2] at line 26 was not appropriately listed in References. 3) At line 110, change model for modelled 4) The text from line 156 to 159 is confused. Revised it. 5) The definition of the overall efficiency in the Eq (17) is wrong because the COP of Carnot cycle is better than the COP of a real cycle. 6) at lines 304, 306, 324 and 330, change the word "compares" for "compared" 7) Comment the hypotheses (ii), (iii) and (iv) (lines 200 and 201). What are the difficulties of considering irreversibility, pressure drop and a real compressor in the simulation? 8) Revise the text from line 313-316. I think the use of periods or comma is deficient. 9) Put the units of the Refrigerating effect in the Figures 6 and 7. 10) I think that the correct at line 318 is "Figs. 4 and 5". If this is true, some reference to Fig 6 must be done, for example at line 307. 11) In Figures 6 and 7, there aren't results for Ammonia? If there exist they don't appear in legend. 12) At line correct the phrase to "increase with the" 13) In the Figures 1 and 2, some legends are blocking a complete view of the scheme of equipments (evaporator in Fig 1) or graphs (lines of process in Fig 2).	The reviewer comments and suggestions are constructive ones and all have been effected appropriately in this revised copy. Thanks.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) At line 19 of the manuscript, I suggest the following written: ... ill health and diseases for living beings. I think the phrase “non living things” doesn’t make sense. 2) sometimes appear in the text the word Ammonia (the first letter as a capital character) and ammonia (the first letter as a non capital character). I suggest the option by one of them. 3) At line 134, put a blank space after the parenthesis 4) I suggest the following text at line 171: component are presented in next subsections.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think after the suggested corrections the manuscript may be considered for publication. However, there exist others works with comparisons for more refrigerants than those considered in this manuscript.	