



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Review Comments:- The manuscript entitles “Oscillatory Blood Flow in Convergent and Divergent Channels,Part 1: Effects of Pulse Amplitude and Local Constriction Height” is notably significant in fluid dynamics especially in medical sciences. In this manuscript, the author claimed that the pulse amplitude and height of constriction reduce the axial velocity and pressure but increase the radial velocity and wall shear stress. I have overview the whole manuscript heedfully and I found that the manuscript contain much novelty. So, I therefore, recommended the manuscript for publication with some major corrections is as follows: 1. The title of the manuscript is not clear. The author mentioned part 1. How many parts has been related with the title. The author must be clear regarding that. So, the author has to rewrite the title like “Effects of Pulse Amplitude and Local Constriction Height for oscillatory Blood Flow in Convergent and Divergent Channels”.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. The introduction section is very poor and the author has write so many para including introduction. It did not maintain standard quality. At first the author has to give briefly discussion of the previous work regarding the title. Afterward, they has to find out the weak point. Finally, the author has to highlight his own contribution. However, the manuscript did not write like that. 3. The author used very old paper in reference section. So, the author has to include minimum 25% paper which published last 3 or 4 years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alal Hosen
Department, University & Country	Department of Mathematics, Rajshahi University of Engineering and Technology, Bangladesh