

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Review in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_42678
Title of the Manuscript:	Transient MHD Natural Convective Flow Past a Heated Vertical Non-porous Surface with Thermal Radiation and Double-Diffusion Effects.
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In general throughout the text English is very poor. Abstract should be clearly re-written about the present work. In introduction section most of the references are not relevant to the study. Flow geometry is not clear. Mathematical formulation and solution is doubtful. For example: Eq.(2) the last term is wrongly presented. Briefly describe, what is the method of solution for equations (18)-(25)? The resolution of few graphs and their captions are not good. Result discussion is poor. There is no novelty, no	We want to respond to your comment sequentially as given. That the English is poor. Pls give suggestions on how to refine the work, for this is the essence of reviewing a paper. However, we have read through the work again for further improvement. That most of the literatures are irrelevant. Point them out for expulsion, as the lit(s) there are for Newtonian flow over vertical plates. That the diagram is not clear. What are your suggestions towards improving this, from your

	new significance of the said parameters on the flow phenomena. Validation with earlier published results with various mathematical procedures is a suggestive measure. Incorporate the following: Mass and heat transfer effect on MHD flow of a visco-elastic fluid through porous medium with oscillatory suction and heat source, International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer, 57(2) (2013)433-438, Free convective flow of visco-elastic fluid in a vertical channel with Dufour effect, World Applied Sciences Journal, 28(9) (2013)1275-1280, Free Convective Fluctuating MHD Flow through Porous Media Past a Vertical Porous Plate with Variable Temperature and Heat Source, Physics Research International, 2014 (2014)Article ID 587367, 8 pages, MHD flow of a visco-elastic fluid through a porous medium between infinite parallel plates with time dependent suction, Journal of Hydrodynamics, 27(5)(2015) 840-847, Chemical reaction effect on MHD viscoelastic fluid flow over a vertical stretching sheet with heat source / sink, Ain Shams Engineering Journal.	perspective? The error in eqn (2) has been rectified. Check. Description of perturbation method required. This is a paper. Its focus is on a domain of study and not on methodology. The expected audience for the paper is not a novice. However, a brief description of the perturbation approach is presented on lines 227-232. Check. On the figures. We may not understand what you mean. Pls point these out. However, we have checked and revised the graphs and made corrections where necessary. Check. On the validation of results, how do you want it done? Suggestions are welcomed. However, any methods of solution can be adopted for solving similar problems. The most important thing is getting similar results, i.e. the involving parameters being investigated must have similar results. Suggest what you feel we should do. On the incorporation of possibly, your work into the lit. review, why do you feel they are necessary in this work and must be put in? It is clear that the problem under consideration is assumed Newtonian. The literatures in a domain of study cannot be exhausted in a paper. More so, we carefully selected our cited lit(s) to be sure we limited ourselves to Newtonian cases as they assumed. Upon this, only the #3 of your suggested reference is adopted in. Being Non-Newtonian, the visco-elastic cases in #1,#2,#4, #5 are left out. Furthermore, the #4 is on channel flow.
--	--	--

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		