



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-The paragraph titled comparative results Starting line 282 to line 320 , is a very long one it should be divided into separate sections with an evidence from literature on each section. -The references added should confirm the results mentioned and support the idea of the simulation - Comparing with other mathematical would be important to emphasize on the importance of the author model - The advantages of the mathematical model should be outlined more clearly - The explanation of the theory is very elementary in lines 203-224. It is basic knowledge that should be mentioned very briefly	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Table 2, 3 need to be professionally Formatted -General spelling mistakes, example line 350 - Extra spacing that need to be revised all over the manuscript , example line 415	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Irene Samy Fahim
Department, University & Country	Mechanical Engineering. American University In Cairo, Egypt