

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_109664
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental study and determination of the energy performance of an air conditioning system using the Peltier method
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. Yes the work carried out is good and an alternate solution for air conditioning system.</p> <p>2. Yes the title suits the research carried out. But its can be reframes by removing "the" added before peltier effect in the title.</p> <p>3. Yes it is fine but this sentence in the abstract can be reframed to make it more meaningful "and that further research should allow to improve the system".</p> <p>4. The subsections of 2.1 and 2.2 has subsections inside which can be numbered.</p> <p>5. Yes the manuscript is technically implemented which can be seen from the design and implementation.</p> <p>6. There are no references from 2023 and only very few papers are cited from 2022 as well, more references should be included from recent years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Except the mentioned corrections in points 2 and 3 remaining are fine.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The research carried out is good and I congratulate the authors for their good work, the minor corrections are mentioned in the above points.</p> <p>2. The points to be improved to make the paper look still better is to add a comparison table for comparing your results in terms of all mentioned parameters with the conventional methods is missing.</p> <p>3. The economical balance chart is too high and the realtime application cost of your air conditioning system is not mentioned, kindly include it considering the consumers of all categories.</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)
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:	Lavanya M
Department, University & Country	Saveetha School of Engineering, SIMATS, India