

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2095
Title of the Manuscript:	Supersonic flow in shortened rocket engine nozzle with a bell-shaped tip
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The purpose of the work is to generalize the study results of supersonic flows in a shortened nozzle with a bell-shaped tip and analyze the effect of the base nozzle length, different connection angles of the tip with the conical nozzle part, inlet and external pressure on the flow characteristics in the nozzle. The static pressure in the cross section at the tip end of both nozzles is proportional to the pressure at the nozzle inlet at operating in the upper layers of the atmosphere. For working at height, the coefficient depends practically on the pressure at the entrance to the nozzle; there is a slight tendency to the influence of the angle changing on the coefficient and the decrease of the coefficient with an increase in the connection angle of tip to the nozzle.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Write notations and corresponding values properly using symbols and equation editor. Abstract should be more concise.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Mostly.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	• Many typographical errors are present in the manuscript. • Reference citations should be in order in the introduction section. • Mesh information during CFD analysis should be included. • Figure quality are very poor. • Information regarding numbering for Figure 2 and 3 are missing in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not in proper format and sequence. The number of references are ok.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is moderate.	
Optional/General comments	NIL	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dhaval B. Shah
Department, University & Country	Nirma University, India