

Review of: "Classical Thermodynamics: Primacy of Dissymmetry Over Free Energy"

Boris Kostov¹

¹ University of Ruse Angel Kanchev

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Abstract is quite well, but eventually consider small changes - maybe Abstract could be slightly changed. The abstract is expected to include a brief digest of the research, that is - new methods, results, concepts, and conclusions only. The abstract needs to be more focused, and achievements should be clearly mentioned. Should be brief but should contain the key parts of the paper: background and research gaps identification, research approach/method, results, and conclusions. Must underline the scientific novelty/claim of the paper. Should not be a re-statement of the conclusions.
2. The conclusions should also highlight the progress in understanding of knowledge presented in the work. Please emphasize more what specific conclusions are useful for practice.
3. I rate this paper at a good level, but mostly as an overview of processes related to chemical thermodynamics. A good number of literary sources are taken into account, but it is not apparent what is new (if there is such an element, let it be specified and emphasized).
4. It is recommendable for each figure to present the source (e.g., "Source: Author's own conception/calculation, based on XXX software) in the subfigured text.
5. It is not usual practice to use the Saxon Genitive in technical documents, so maybe you can reconsider using it in your text. In addition to that, it may be better to use the Present Simple or Present Perfect instead of the Past Simple tense (as can be seen in the text).
6. Regardless of the critical remarks, after taking into account the reviewers' comments, I consider this article to be published.