

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_129223
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Analysis of Desiccant Dehumidifier with an Expanded Regeneration Section
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript is useful in Agriculture domain to minimise the wastage of vegetables due to high humidity and also to increase the shelf life of fruits and vegetables.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is precise. There is no need of any addition or deletion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar of the manuscript is OK	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>1. Qp and S-DAC not defined.</p> <p>2. Dehumidification COP not properly defined.</p> <p>3. There is no reference of formula used for Δh (Latent heat of vaporization of water)</p> <p>4. h_3 & h_1 mentioned in the dehumidification COP expression not defined.</p> <p>5. How humidity level of process air altered so accurately as 60%, 70%, 80% & 90%? PI mention</p> <p>6. What is the basis of using process air flow rate at 350m³/h and regeneration air flow rate at 760m³/h?? pl mention.</p> <p>7. In para (iii) & (iv) of result and discussion, process air inlet RH mentioned as 61.5%, 70.25%, 80.5% & 91% but in all performance results inlet air RH mentioned as 60%, 70%, 80% and 90%. PI make suitable corrections.</p> <p>8. In all performance graphs, X-axis and Y-axis is not defined. pl define.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamal Kumar Ghosh
Department, University & Country	College of Military Engineering, India