



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_PSIJ_24052   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Numerical Modeling of Coupled Thermoelasticity with relaxation times in Rotating FGAPs Subjected to a Moving Heat Source</b> |
| 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**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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)  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The temperature and displacement are determined numerically for a 2D FGAP using DRBEM modeling. The formulation of the equations is well detailed and the text is well written on the whole. The authors are requested to improve their paper with the following remarks:</p> <p>1) <u>Section 2</u>: all the terms must be defined for clarity like <math>R</math>, <math>C</math>, <math>\xi</math>, <math>n_b</math> or others.</p> <p>2) <u>Section 4</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the shape of the heat source given by equation (72) ?</li> <li>- The meaning of <math>u_1</math> and <math>u_2</math> should be recalled.</li> <li>- To show the accuracy of the DRBEM method, the differences with FEM have to be quantified (in %).</li> <li>- What is then the interest of the DRBEM method?</li> </ul> <p>3) There is no conclusion. Please attend to this matter.</p> | <p>The author would like to thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions &amp; constructive comments, which helped us to improve the manuscript.</p> <p>Region <math>R</math> with boundary <math>C</math> and all symbols were cleared in the revised paper.</p> <p>Modified in Abstract (line 20), Section 4 (line 232), Conclusion (line 265)</p> <p>They were cleared in this section (line 248)</p> <p>The accuracy had been cleared from figures of comparison</p> <p>Advantages of BEM at (Lines 75-92)</p> <p>Conclusion had been Added (Lines 259-267)</p> |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments | Please correct:<br><br>line 36: computed experimentally (meaning ?)<br><br>line 39: with the ones in a steady state<br><br>line 43: which are examples<br><br>line 79: Cartesian coordinate system<br><br>lines 170 and 175: consists in<br><br>line 196: therefore they do not<br><br>line 212: referring to the recent work | Modified ( Line 50) in revised paper<br><br>Modified (Line 53) in revised paper<br><br>Modified (Line 57) in revised paper<br><br>Modified (Line 104) in revised paper<br><br>Modified (Line 196, Line 202) in revised<br><br>Modified(Line 230) in revised paper<br><br>Modified (Line 238) in revised paper |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|