

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
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.journalenrr.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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Reviewed paper concerns "The performance of a domestic refrigerator using various low-GWP refrigerants. R404A, R440A, R513A, and R452A are investigated as prospective R134A replacements." This paper is suitable for publication in Journal of Energy Research and Reviews, but after the answer on the comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title is not soft to understand, and it should be improved.</li> <li>2. The original points must be explained well.</li> <li>3. Add the main results in the abstract</li> <li>4. I cannot find any phenomenological background of this study. The authors have to explain why this problem should be discussed. We did it because we could do it is not appropriate answer.</li> <li>5. I think that there is some interesting aspect in this paper, but the overall presentation is very confuse and misleading.</li> <li>6. In the entire text, abbreviations should be explained where they are first used, and only abbreviations should be used afterward. Please check the entire text.</li> <li>7. This is only a simulation study; however, it would be good if they further test a similar system for its actual behavior.</li> <li>8. Fournissez une discussion approfondie plus détaillée des chiffres présentés.</li> <li>9. Some of the old and less related works can be removed from the literature review and it can be updated using recent works.</li> <li>10. Quantify some of the main outcome in the conclusion.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### **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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rebhi Redha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Medea, Algeria</b>