



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_31687
Title of the Manuscript:	Green's Function (GF) For the Two Dimensional (2D) Time Dependent Inhomogeneous Wave Equation.
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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The numerical results obtained by the equations (2.20), (2.39), (2.43),(2.47) and (2.51) in section 3 should be compared with other numerical results obtained by other methods.</b></p> <p>The sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 needs to revise as the details are not necessary..</p>	Normally, in any research paper, results are compared to other results if available. However we are constrained by the fact that no other researcher has used this method hence the comparison of our results with other method may not be possible.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 are required to write more simply. .</p>	The details of sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 may not be necessary and new, they are brought in for the sake of emphasis. However, the inclusion of the sections you will agree with me, does not invalidate the originality/clarity of this research paper.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This paper uses Green's function to analysis the waves phenomenon. This topic seems not interesting. The sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 seems not new and they are fundamental results.</p> <p>The sections 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 are good.</p>	