

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_121426
Title of the Manuscript:	Study and Sizing of Centrifugal Pumps: The Case of SOMAİR's 2013 Pumps
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides a thorough insight into the Sizing of Centrifugal Pump. It effectively sized the pumps, choosing the type of pump and the material best suited to each type of circuit, and taking into account the characteristics of the fluid being pumped.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript effectively captures the content of the manuscript	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the manuscript's scope, including the economic viability and societal contributions of a geology degree. It summarizes the key findings and arguments effectively.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure and subsections are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript effectively outlines the resizing of centrifugal pumps by analyzing the existing situation for each circuit. The points mentioned are well-supported by scientific research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient. However, including more recent studies or reports from 2023 or 2024 could provide additional context and relevance.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English are suitable for scholarly communication and readable.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madu, Francis Michael
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria