



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_23262
Title of the Manuscript:	On Thermodynamic Peculiarities of the Absorption Heat Transformers
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

**General guideline for 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 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>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your analysis based on previous literatures is not clear. This will be from lack of comparison data.</li> <li>2. <math>f</math>(the circulation ratio of solution.) is expected to be an important role, but the definition and value, also the method to retrieve from data is not clear.</li> <li>3. Conclusion is not sure to understand your work.</li> <li>4. In line 215, "Carnot cycle by a factor larger than 2.2", how 2.2 was obtained?</li> <li>5. To verify or validate your work, please use enough data or try to make your experimental works.</li> </ol>	<p>1. The proposed analysis is based not on the literature, as it is suggested by the reviewer, but exclusively on the facts that are specific to the well-known absorption refrigerators and to new absorption heat engines.</p> <p>2. In this paper it is assumed that the heat exchanger efficiency of the solution is equal to 100%. In this case, the significance of the circulation ratio is relatively small.</p> <p>3. This conclusion becomes more understandable if one familiarizes oneself with the papers of the author indicated in this article.</p> <p>4. In the text of the article is written "equivalent Carnot cycle" but not "Carnot cycle", as it is indicated in the review.</p> <p>5. The theoretical analysis proposed by the author corresponds with the reality to a greater extent than earlier and opens up further prospects for the development of power industry.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		