



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your analysis based on previous literatures is not clear. This will be from lack of comparison data. 2. f(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. 3. Conclusion is not sure to understand your work. 4. In line 215, " Carnot cycle by a factor larger than 2.2", how 2.2 was obtained? 5. To verify or validate your work, please use enough data or try to make your experimental works. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 3. This conclusion becomes more understandable if one familiarizes oneself with the papers of the author indicated in this article. 4. In the text of the article is written "equivalent Carnot cycle" but not "Carnot cycle", as it is indicated in the review. 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.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		