



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Energy Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_48540
Title of the Manuscript:	Computational analysis for good thermal exchange and low pressure drop in regenerative air preheaters
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

**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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove typo mistakes and grammatically mistakes</li> <li>2. Add the nomenclature part.</li> <li>3. Enrich and improve the Introduction section with new references.</li> <li>4. The original points must be explained well.</li> <li>5. Write the conclusion in the form of important points.</li> </ol>	<p>We greatly appreciate the time and focus of the reviewers dedicated to our manuscript. The reviewers' comments are highly constructive. We sincerely believe that the reviewers' comments have helped us to improve the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript was revised.</li> <li>2. The nomenclature section was added.</li> <li>3. The Introduction section was improved and new references were included.</li> <li>4. The Introduction section was improved for a better explanation of the original points. The abstract section also was improved.</li> <li>5. The conclusion was written in the form of important points.</li> </ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some explanation of the used method is useful if include in revised form</li> <li>- Results discussion is limited.</li> </ul>	The results and discussion section was revised and rewritten in order to improve the results discussion. New graphs were also included in this section.

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	