



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_16328
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical simulation and measurement of temperature distribution in water-in-glass evacuated solar water heater
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formatting of the paper is not acceptable 2. Line 56, 63 and 64 should be arranged in organised manner. 3. Line 201, the tube size of 58 and 45mm is used in the paper but practically 58 and 47mm is in the market why? 4. Line 445 and 446 "Although the days are close to each other, there was a big difference in the ambient temperature for example may the 20th and 21" not clearly understandable. It should be explain briefly. 5. Figure 6, X-axis shows what? 6. In this paper only give the information of the flows, no technical data is used to justification of the results. 7. In the conclusion no data is given only theoretical explanation is given. Some results also added. 8. Why fluent 6.1 is used? 9. Add latest references. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moved the nomenclature to the end of paper to follow the accepted format 2. Line 56, 63 and 64: corrected 3. Line 201: We measured the dimensions of the tubes and found it to be 58 and 47 mm. I think at times minor differences are found between the quoted measurements and the actual measurements for particular cases. 4. Lines 445 and 446: The statement was not really meaningful and was deleted. 5. Figure 6: the x-axis shows time in seconds. The spacing on the word time was removed so that the word is spelt correctly. 6. The research focused on the flow 7. Some results were added in the conclusion 8. When the paper was written Fluent 6.1 was the latest version 9. The model and the paper are not recent. The model was developed and was not used. Recently we started using the model and found it to be very useful in designing the novel solar water heater



SDI Review Form 1.6

		that we are developing and that's when we thought of publishing the work so that other researchers may access it. Thus we thought of leaving the references like that, since they are the ones that were incorporated in the model.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		