

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_110642
Title of the Manuscript:	Proposal of application of a simple analysis code DYMOS for accident analyses of molten salt reactors
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The article presents a safety and transient analysis code (DYMOS) for the molten salt reactor (MSR). As demonstrated by the authors, the proposed code provides good accuracy and performance for small experimental MSRs. The main result developed and discussed by the authors is an extension of this code for larger reactors, which makes it possible to analyze safety and predict accidents that may occur in nuclear installations. The manuscript is well written and clearly reported, and provides useful information. The study adds important new and relevant knowledge on accident prediction and analysis in MSR. I recommend this manuscript for publication in the Journal of Energy Research and Reviews. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes	Thank you very much for your kind comments.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The quality of the paper is correct and suitable for scholarly communications	Thank yo very much for your kindcomment.
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) none	