



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_23221
Title of the Manuscript:	Oscillatory Blood Flow in Convergent and Divergent Channels, Part 1: Effects of Pulse Amplitude and Local Constriction Height
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	- Page 2, line 77, Eq. (6). How realistic is it to take the the flux across a cross-section of the tube as varying with $e^{i\beta t}$ - What consequences for flow performance of blood could one physically expect from imaginary part of $e^{i\beta t}$? - It is not understood, why authors have compared effects of two types of input with a completely different input convergent and divergent profile and how it gives confidence on	1 In furtherance of research and knowledge, it is expected we build on the shoulders (i.e. the foundational works) of research giants. This work is built on [8]. Therefore, the flux is as realistic as it is in [8]. Your advice will be highly welcomed as it will help to improve the quality of this work. 2 The flow is expected to be oscillatory. 3 As stated earlier, this work is built on [8]. [8] noticed that flow separation occurred in all the geometries. In comparison, we saw this, too. We are confident of the analytic solutions here, in as much
Minor REVISION comments	The work has many typos and grammatical mistakes that must be corrected! For example see - Line 120 and 121 - Line 152 - Line 187 - Line 218	These have been taken care of.
Optional/General comments		