



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17530
Title of the Manuscript:	Nozzle Shape Optimization to Achieve the Maximum Gain in the GDLs
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	The MS needs English edition Especial characters and equations should be improved. They are almost illegible.	It is revised.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: It reads "The results show that the best possible geometry..." What is the best possible geometry? Consider that I am reading the abstract so I need to know what geometries were studied. Consider, also, to mention that the steady state approach was used. Introduction: Avoid the use of too general expressions for instance Line 37 "The laser technology is used in different situations..." What are those situations? This is only one example. Methodology: Line 89. What is AUSM+ this acronym is not defined. Is it Advection Upstream Splitting Method?	It is revised. It is revised. It is revised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Is this section is described the validity of the used approach (Lines 91 to 96), what is correct, however figures 1 and 2 are results, hence, those figures should be placed in the section of results and discussion. In figures 1 and 2, it is suggested, if possible, to compute R^2 for the assessment of data. In figure 3. It is suggested to show flow direction. Results and discussion: Line 151. There is no need to write "gas dynamic laser" GDL is enough. Figures 4 an 6 needs improvement More discussion is needed.	It is revised. It is shown. It is revised.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No comment	