

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	<u>Theory and Applications of Engineering Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BP_8333E
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Computational Fluid Dynamics Analysis of a Fume Extraction System for a Welding Company in Guyana
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	"Yes, the manuscript is particularly relevant to the Fume Extraction System for a Welding Company, making it highly pertinent to this study."	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, no need of alternative titles	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	comprehensive and to better highlight mathematical results.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	"The manuscript requires further improvement in accordance with grammatical and spelling rules."	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	<p>"Comments to the Author:</p> <p>The current manuscript, titled 'Computational Fluid Dynamics Analysis of a Fume Extraction System for a Welding Company,' requires significant revisions. While the CFD methodology is somewhat clearly explained, the results lack proper discussion and accompanying plots. Although conclusions are well drawn, a comprehensive discussion is missing. The following comments aim to enhance the overall quality of the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract, remove the word 'operation' from the first line. 2. The text in Fig 1 and 2 is not legible. Additionally, modify Fig 5 (Framework Design). 3. The manuscript does not explicitly mention the research gap. 4. Include a mesh independence analysis, presenting mesh information in a table. 5. Display a residual graph and indicate whether the solution converged or not." 	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Update with a few more references on Fume Extraction System for a Welding.	

BPI Review Form 070520

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:	Tesfaye Barza Zema
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University of Technology, Ethiopia