



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	any research paper should have a conventional order in the writing such introduction, state of art, adopted methodology, validations, results and discussions and conclusions, all this aspects did not find this in the paper and this introduces some confusions. the authors stated that they used CFD analysis but they did not introduce any details about the CFD methodologies, CFD models, Mesh details, CFD model validations....etc. For all CFD studies in the first step a mesh independency study has to be performed, otherwise, it is hard to evaluate the size of the numerical errors. Have you performed one? If yes, what were the results? If no, a mesh independency study should be performed. Even if a CFD study is performed, the results should be validated with an benchmark experimental study.	The order was still followed in this paper, the methodology covers section 2 and 3. It is evident in section 3 that all details about the CFD methodologies and others were covered. It was stated that tetrahedral elements were used and details about the solvers were also given in section 3. The mesh independency test was carried out before coming up with the numerical simulation. Experimental study has not been carried out but findings substantiate facts given with STHE_T and STHE_RT in open literature as given in line 161 to 163.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		