



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_28607
Title of the Manuscript:	Existence of global attractor for Caginalp hyperbolic system phase field with polynomial growth potential
Type of the Article	

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	1. The overall English expression is bad. It should be revised by a native speaker. 2. All of the following mathematical expressions should be revised as: $\frac{v}{t}(t) \neq \frac{v(t)}{t}$ $\frac{t}{t}(t) \neq \frac{t(t)}{t}$ and other similar expressions if there are. 3. The authors should explain about global attractor more detail in introduction and conclusion parts.	After accepting the remarks on the manuscript, so I made the revision as you wonder. I think your remarks are true, I refer you the revised document, thinking to have done better than previous. Thank you
Minor REVISION comments		Your way to treat a document submitted is adequate and minor revisions were specific to perfect the document. So I'm about to welcome your new comments. Thank you
Optional/General comments		