

## REVIEWS ON THE MANUSCRIPT [21]

### Reviewer 1:

The manuscript is satisfying reasonable expectations and is not recommended.

### Reviewer 2:

Unfortunately this paper is in a very bad shape.

The structure is bad with the conclusion coming first and containing a lot of facts that you don't understand until you have read the whole paper and not even then.

The paper contains several serious errors and does not correlate luminous efficiency with the temperature of the lamp filament.

Figures and tables consistently lack units of the quantities used.

I do not recommend this paper, however, but for the future benefit of the authors I will specify a number of points where I have serious objections.

In figure 1 there is no explanation of what the different bars relate to, there is no unit on the vertical axis, the horizontal axis presumably refers to temperature (this is hinted at in the text) but it is not clear to what temperature and only by looking at table 2 at the end it is clear that it is not actually the temperature at all.

The notation in the formulas on page 4 top does not correspond to the notation in the text. The first and second formulas are wrong, in the first formula a "1" is used for the current "I". "T" and "t" are confusingly used for both temperature and time, sometimes "θ" for temperature. Formulas on the bottom of page 4 have several errors.

Table 1 entirely lacks units and I am not sure what numbers like 1/62 mean. If it means the decimal number 1.62 it seems that the experimentally determined heat capacity of the oil varies by a factor of 2 and it is not clear what value has been used subsequently and no explanation is given. The figure caption states that the current (currency) is 400 A that is clearly absurd.

The terminology sometimes is non-standard. Heat capacity is once called specific resistance force, current is called currency.

Table 2 has no units or explanatory text for the columns, the reader has to guess the meaning of the numbers. I am also utterly confused by this table.

The voltage over the lamp is almost constant which means the temperature of the filament is essentially constant. The only thing, essentially, that is changed is the duration of the experiment, so whatever is determined in the last column L/Q is not what is asked for in the problem.

### Reviewer 3:

The text is not written clearly and neither contains the essential protocols and results of the experiments, nor any clear physical analysis.

The paper is not meeting, unfortunately, the necessary level and may not be recommended.

Presented are the plots with no meaningful parameters, where the x-axis represents the number of the experiment. The reported values leave little or no chance to understand what data have been collected.

I doubt that, even after a major correction, this manuscript may contain material worthy of publication and do not encourage revision or resubmission for this book.