



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_58522
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Optimization of Exergy Efficiency of a Crude Distillation unit using Artificial Neural Network (ANN) And Response Surface Methods (RSM).
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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. In the introduction, the authors introduce, the importance of they work. However, they should review the literature, more comprehensively. They didn't cite enough works using, the methods "RSM" and "ANN" to optimize the exergy efficiency in distillation process and in particularly in crude oil distillation. Please extend the introduction and review the literature more comprehensive</li> <li>2. Is there any other work in the literature that studies the Crude Distillation unit using Artificial Neural Network (ANN) And Response Surface Methods (RSM)? Please give more explanation about the novelty of the paper with more clearance</li> <li>3. In the presentation of result, in page 20, paragraph "optimization of the atmospheric distillation unit": at the beginning of the paragraph, I could believe that, figures 4 and 5 are results of this work, but I notice that, they are referred to [22], can you give more explanation for that?</li> <li>4. On page 9 line 14 you wrote: "model <sup>21</sup>", 21 refers to reference or something else? Explain please.</li> <li>5. I think that, it's better to number paragraphs. In addition, some paragraphs title don't have some style as the others. For example the title " Response surface method (RSM)" on page 9</li> <li>6. It's better to have a nomenclature in the paper</li> <li>7. It's better to extend the conclusion</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In my opinion, the paper deals with a very interesting subject and generally well written. The methods presented in this work, is well done by the authors. There are however number of issues that the authors would need to address before the paper can be accepted</p> <p>In generally the paper is good, except minor corrections as mentioned above</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Malik El'houyoum Ahamadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Comoros, Comoros</b>