



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_30177
Title of the Manuscript:	Electroconductivity of steady viscous MHD incompressible fluid between two porous parallel plates provoked by chemical reaction and radiation
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. The paper deals with an interesting topic. But authors must be using high quality references (either as a model for drafting or validation) It is suggested that these references: Mebarek-Oudina, F., Bessaïh, R. (2014) "Numerical modeling of MHD stability in a cylindrical configuration," <i>Journal of the Franklin Institute</i> 351 (2), 667–681.</p> <p>Rajesh V (2011) Chemical reaction and radiation effects on the transient MHD free convection flow of dissipative fluid past an infinite vertical porous plate with ramped wall temperature. <i>Chem Ind Chem Eng Quar</i> 17, 189–198 .</p> <p>2. In the nomenclature part, authors must add units for variables (symbols) and details for dimensionless numbers.</p> <p>3. The quality of the figures 2-6 are not good (some data of the figures are not clear). The authors must be redrawing these figures.</p> <p>4. The author has just reported figures and scientific reasons for the observations is not provided. Add this part in conclusion.</p> <p>5. Hartmann number H must be written as Ha .</p> <p>This work is interesting. The discussion is acceptable. In addition this manuscript is written carefully.</p>	<p>Added</p> <p>The dimensionless section has taken care of the units.</p> <p>Mathematical software was used in plotting the figures. Difficult to redraw</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Correction effected</p>
Optional/General comments		