



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_20021
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Shell and Tube Heat Exchangers with Varying Tube Layouts
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The value of the analysis is highly questionable due to the fact that there is not validation of the model at all. It is not clear what his contribution. The mathematical description need to be improved due to the fact that it is not clear. The description of the fluids involved in this phenomenon is not clear and is also incomplete. It is not described the element size in the mesh of the finite element and also it is not presented a complete description of the element used. The description of STHE_T, STHE_RT and STHE_C needs to be more extensive and clear. Is imperative to perform a more extensive literature review	The main aim of this work was to make comparison of the tube layouts. The mathematical model that was used to characterize the thermal-hydraulic flow was given in section 3 from line 81 to 94. The fluids considered were given to be water in tube and oil in shell in section 2. The elements used were given to be tetrahedral elements in section 3, line 100. With the descriptions given in paragraphs 3 and 5 in section 1, and figures 1 and 2, the descriptions of STHE_T, STHE_RT and STHE_C should be clear enough. More literatures have been reviewed again and we have added paragraph 4 in colour yellow.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Figure 2 need to be improved. Figure 3 is incomplete; it does not have any scale.	The reviewer did not really specify what is needed to be added to Figure 2. Clear understanding of this can be seen from paragraphs 3 and 5 in the section 1, and paragraph 1 in section 2. The scales are there in Figure 3 and may not be adjusted further.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 may be improved	This has been taken care of.