

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Science and Technology: Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2401
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of a two-wavelength pyrometer system and spectral pyrometry for high-temperature measurements
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 authors measure integrated thermal radiation in two wavelength regions (932 - 1300 nm and 400-872 nm) to infer temperature of the emitter and compare it with results obtained from radiation profile measurements in two regions (529-870 nm [why it is not 400-872 nm not clear] and 932-1140 nm). To correct the profile distortion due to various factors (wave length dependent emissivity, distortion in the optical path of the measurement setup etc), a black body radiator is used. They find the former method to be faster and to have better accuracy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The heading is misleading as it indicate the use of two single wavelengths while two wavelength bands are used. The full text needs to be written in a coherent manner.	
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.	The paper lack any coherence and have several formatting errors.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Equations 1,2,3 and 4 are wrongly formatted.	
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.	An integrated form of equation 1 over the wavelength band should be used. This error goes undetected probably due to the fact that the coefficient of 1/T is still a constant. The claim of better accuracy needs an explanation. It appears to be due to better statics only. The paper require to be rewritten focusing on the current approach and keeping it coherent. The approach described in the paper, because of the use of integrated profiles, offers faster measurement without compromising on the accuracy and considered for publication after a full revision.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	OK	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO, Needs revision.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	V. Vijayakumar
Department, University & Country	Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, India