

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_108851
Title of the Manuscript:	AN IDEAL GAS INDEED DOES WORK in EXPANSION INTO VACUUM
Type of the Article	Short communications

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. No, the manuscript is not important for scientific community. Unfortunately, it contains big errors that can mislead the readers, especially the students.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct because it contains big errors that can mislead the readers, especially the students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the equation (2) is valid only when a gas expands in a quasistatic process. Unfortunately, the author of this manuscript wrongly applies this equation - the equations (3) and (4) are completely wrong. They are valid only for adiabatic isobaric expansion of gases. If they are valid, one infers that $P_2=P_1$ but "P2 above atmospheric pressure P1" (page 2) - using these wrong equations, at the end of Theory sections, the author obtains $C_A=3.6R$ and $C_P=2.6R$. Below the equation (4), the author states "In [8] it was shown that $C_A = C_V$" (page 2). Therefore, the heat ratio $\gamma=C_P/C_V=2.6/3.6<1$. However, the heat ratio is always bigger than 1 (1.4 for air). <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niculescu Mihai Leonida
Department, University & Country	National Institute for Aerospace Research, Romania