



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19147
Title of the Manuscript:	Useful Working Fluids for Feasible Super Efficient Trilateral Cycles
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. I am so wondering that your solution process to find optimum working fluid for your thermal cycle. - I could not catch why you tried many different fluids - What is the selection procedure? - Do you have to do all working fluids to test? - Is there any idea to check possible working fluids for your system based on thermo physical properties? 2. My guess based on reference [9], If you have other results with different working fluids, please analyze your results and find the optimum working fluid for your cycle. 3. Figures excess the blank area(Fig. 3). 4. You present Fig. 4-6 of CO₂, how about try to present other example of another working fluid. (Almost same figures in Ref [9]) Please try to improve your paper, check with Ref [9] such as equations, figures etc.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Chungbuk National University, South Korea