

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98329
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis and research of compound refrigeration based on logic control battery
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes. It has proven through study hybrid cooling method based on logic control has good cooling performance in power battery thermal management. It provides a new solution and design idea for lithium ion battery thermal management. 2. Suitable title. 3. The abstract should be concise and informative. It should not exceed 300 words in length. Current Abstract has exceeded 300 words. Refer https://journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/about/submissions#authorGuidelines 4. Appropriate and well written. 5. Scientifically Correct with enough reference 6. Author has used sufficient references to support arguments	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Mostly appropriate except For Figure 3 needs translation / need to be relabelled before publication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subramaniam Jahanadan
Department, University & Country	Kolej Matrikulasi Labuan, Malaysia