



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29100
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Radiation on unsteady MHD free convective flow past an exponentially accelerated inclined plate with exponential heat and mass diffusion
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	(1) It is not properly written. Specially, introduction part is not introducing any relevant idea about the present work. Result and discussion is also not well documented. In name of paper there is written effect of radiation but radiation is not mentioned in abstract. (2) Presentation is not good. (3) It is just extended work (minor change) of reference 11. (4) Graphs are too many, and not are in same size and patterns. (5) Author should show the verification of numerical code either by table of values or by comparison.	Radiation is described in elaborately. This paper has many changes from the reference paper 11. Graphs are reduced and all are trying to make in same size. If the numerical values are required in absence of graphs then I will add numerical values in future.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) Author should include some fundamental research papers in references as well as some papers showing the application of this topic. (2) Formatting of paper should be correct (see the conclusion).	If you recommend some specific references then I will add those into my paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is no proper literature survey have done before writing the introduction. There is no verification of numerical technique properly.	Due to brevity numerical technique has not describe in elaborately.