



**SDIReviewForm1.6**

Journal Name:	<u><b>AsianJournal ofPhysicaland ChemicalSciences</b></u>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOPACS_35103</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Electrochemical cell equipment for salinity gradient power generation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guidelineforPeer Reviewprocess:**

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: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDIReviewForm1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript is lack of scientific base for developing novel electrochemical device.</p> <p>1)the theory is not reasonable for a battery.</p> <p>2)The experimental do not support the topic idea;</p> <p>3) It seems no current forming in this process due to no charge transfer in electrode.</p>	<p>I thank the reviewer for his comments. But, unfortunately his comments are not justified.</p> <p>1. This is not for construction of a battery. This technology is for generation of electricity from salinity gradient in a large scale or real purpose use.</p> <p>2. I don't understand in what respect the reviewer comments like this. Does he really read the article? Experiments are done taking sample from the sea (Bay of Bengal). There is no doubt about its applicability. The only concern is the accuracy to improve the energy density.</p> <p>3. Another unworthy question. This is text</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		