

APPENDIX E

External Examiner's Comments and Answers to the Comments

The external examiner's comments:

1. The whole view of this work is suitable for the Ph.D. Work. The experimental study including the simplified models is a big task and the student could perform very well.
2. Some revisions should be done which are:
 - Some explanations should be revised and exaggerated. Pls. see the comments in the manuscript.
 - For the model, the equilibrium thermodynamic equations are mostly used but the actual states are not equilibrium. It is rather difficult to state the real temp of each unit.

Reply of the author:

Properties of working fluid were obtained as the averaged values while the system was in steady state, which could be realized from the logged data. Therefore, the values used in the calculation could be assumed as the real temperature of each unit.

The other comments in the manuscript had been revised.

3. The optimal conditions or the working ranges have not yet been pointed out.

Reply of the author:

In this study, the experimental DAR was tested with variation of some operating parameters. The system characteristics were found to vary with different operating parameters, which are dependent on each other. Therefore, the optimum working ranges could not yet be clearly specified. However, the DAR performance could be improved with modifications, which are proposed in the conclusions.

4. The tense used in the text. Pls. be careful about this since the past and the present tenses are alternately used in the same paragraph.
5. The unit should be in S.I.

Reply of the author:

The unit used in this report is mostly in S.I. However, some units are presented in English unit such as pipe and tube sizes since it is generally used in practice, which could be realized easier.