

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_95495
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Performance of Alternative Refrigerants with Low Global Warming Potential
Type of the 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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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. The paper deals with an important issue. The study is important because it deals with refrigerant alternatives that are not widely used and the on which the literature is rather limited. 2. The title is suitable. 3. A brief note on the nature of the refrigerant alternatives used in the study would improve the comprehensiveness of the abstract. Also, the use of abbreviations in the abstract is not recommended. 4. Parts of the introduction should preferably be included in the literature survey section. The section on the refrigerant alternatives and Table 5 should be included in the introduction. 5. The manuscript is basically correct. 6. The references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The use of abbreviations in the abstract, such as GWP, is not recommended. 2. Lack of a nomenclature list makes reading the article cumbersome, The inclusion of a Nomenclature list is recommended. 3. Minor language errors need to be corrected. Some errors are marked in red.	
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:	Hassan Al-Haj Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Al-Baath University, Syria