

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_98860
Title of the Manuscript:	STATIC MODEL FOR THE DRAIN RATE OF CLAY EXTRACTION AND POWER CONSUMPTION FOR SAND WASHING
Type of the Article	Research

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:

(<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the understanding of modelling issues, identification of key parameters, consideration of geometric dimensions, development of a static model, and implications for automatic control systems in devices operating on the principle of mixing and dispersion for sand washing.</p> <p>2. The title can be improved as "Analysis on Sand Washing Efficiency: A Static Model for Clay Drain Rate and Power Consumption".</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript should be improved. I suggest changing the title of second section as "Working Principles of Apparatuses", the title of third section as "Results and Discussion".</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient and recent, please use more recently published papers as references; in addition, the reference format is inconsistent, please reformat the citation section.</p> <p>7. The inconsistency in the labeling of figures, sometimes using "Figure" and sometimes "Fig"; Inaccurate representation of units.</p> <p>8. In the introduction section, some additional content should be added to highlight the originality and practical value of this research.</p> <p>9. Please number all formulas in sequential order, and do not selectively number only some of the formulas.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language expression needs to be improved, and I used "review" mode to markup some language editing.</p> <p>(1) In the "INTRODUCTION" section, "the cost of the production as a whole" should be replaced with "the overall product cost"; "Often mixing and dispersion leads to" should be replaced with "Additionally, mixing and dispersion often lead to"; "a clear tendency to increase the degree of their dispersion" should be replaced with "a noticeable trend towards increasing the degree of their dispersion"; "In this sense" should be replaced with "In this context"; "the task of" should be removed; "since such a model..." should be broke as another short sentence to increase the clarity.</p> <p>(2) In the "PROBLEM STATEMENT" section, consider breaking the sentence into shorter.</p> <p>The highlighted text in the first paragraph should be rewritten. My suggested revised version is as follows: "The main factors to consider when choosing mixers and dispersants are productivity, versatility in changing product types, degree of automation, and production cost. Other factors include the type of housing and its location, the shape of its cross-section, the type of agitator, the type of agitator guide device, and the availability and type of jacket for the coolant."</p> <p>The highlighted text in the second paragraph should be rewritten. My suggested revised version is as follows: "it is stated that the efficiency of mixing and dispersing heterogeneous systems is significantly enhanced in apparatuses where additional guiding devices, such as ribs or scrapers,</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>are installed in the housings along with agitators, or in apparatuses with housings shaped as polyhedra or ovals." "said" should be replaced with "mentioned", and "whether there are" should be replaced with "the presence of".</p> <p>The highlighted text after Equation (7) should be rewritten. My suggested revised version is as follows: "The significance of this formula lies in its ability to facilitate the study of the performance of rotary apparatus and the process of dispersing solid particles in a liquid, provided that the condition for its achievement is met. Essentially, it pertains to the time required to obtain a two-phase liquid-solid system within a rotary apparatus."</p> <p>"these studies" should be replaced with "this study", "to form a two-phase system" should be replaced with "during a formation of such a system".</p> <p>Equation (1), Vp unit should be corrected.</p> <p>(3) In the "SOLVING THE PROBLEM" section, "MPas value (millipascal-second)" should be replaced with "millipascal-second (mPa-s) value";</p> <p>The highlighted text following Equation (12) should be rewritten in English;</p> <p>"Figure 2-5 shows" should be replaced with "Figures 2-5 show".</p> <p>(4) In the "CONCLUSION" section, "CONCLUSION" should be "CONCLUSIONS"</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jia Yao</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Wyoming, United States</p>