



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11946
Title of the Manuscript:	An Experimental Investigation of a Nanofluid ($\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3+\text{H}_2\text{O}$) Based Parabolic Trough Solar Collectors
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	1. The manuscript " Experimental.....collectors" describes a very important field of research. However, the manuscript lacks detailed scientific investigations on the subject . Some of the observations are noted below: 1. It is not clear what is the objective of the study and how the objective (s) is derived from the literature survey? 2. The author (s) have only used one composition of nanofluid for completing the experiment. This is not conclusive and needs data on either varying concentration or varying materials etc. 3. With magnetic stirring for 10 h , nanofluids can not be made stable for use. What are the characterizations carried out on such nanofluid prior to use to understand the stability? 4. If the nanofluids are used within one hour, how the solar data was collected from 9 A M till 5 P. m. ? Was the nanofluid stable throughout the day? From Referee's experience, it will not be stable and will give misleading results. 5. What is the significance of section 3.2 ? Any of these equations were used in this study? How the heat transfer coefficients are calculated? 6. If the heat transfer coefficient is same throughout the day, how the efficiency was varying ? 7. The manuscript does not compare the present data	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with data in the literature. This has to be included in the discussion section in order to appreciate the novelty of this work. It is advised that the manuscript needs to address all such issues. The authors must note that by simply magnetic stirring some nanoparticles in water if they can produce nanofluid, then they are not in right path. The authors must first produce a stable nanofluid prior to testing the same. The authors may submit a new manuscript if desired after incorporating referee's comments.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	L. N. Satapathy
Department, University & Country	Ceramic technological institute, BHEL, Bangalore, India