

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_99518
Title of the Manuscript:	Internal Flow Heat Transfer Rate for Parallel Heat Exchanger Pipes One Pass of Rice Husk to Air
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.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)	<p>Yes, An energy transforming system was discussed from waste rice husk.</p> <p>Heat Transfer Analysis of Waste heat recovery Single Pipe Heat Exchanger from Rice Husk</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some more theoretical explanation regarding the measuring mechanism, theoretical Investigation to be provided.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Still better quality to be needed	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The effectiveness of a HE by theoretical and practical manner may be calculated. Then only the real energy conservation system The heat capacity of the rise husk was not discussed . Simply an experimental work carried out. Convective heat transfer co efficient analysis to be made for theoretical measurement of HE, Fig 3 Temperature – time history was studied not the Temperature distribution . As a whole , good experiment work was carried out still some clear heat transfer analysis is mentioned in the content and may be published after the inclusive of above mentioned works. 	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	U. Arunachalam
Department, University & Country	Anna University, India