



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>Physical Science International Journal</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_30035</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Theoretical Computation of Magnetic Field Density within the Vicinity of Rukpokwu 11 KVA Distribution Power Lines</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The word electricity should be replaced with current (line 33).</li> <li>- The full-stops should come after the parentheses citing an author. (see line 35 as an example).</li> <li>- The right acronym for electromagnetic field Force is (EMF). Check line 53,</li> <li>- What Physics laws did authors consider in their work? It is appropriate to state the laws considered. -Define all the terms in equation (1).</li> <li>-The word equivalently should be removed</li> <li>-Increase the font size of all equations used in the work.</li> <li>- Stick to a uniform justification style; See line 33 to 49, these lines are left justified.</li> <li>-In line 210, the word study area is most appropriate.</li> <li>Check justification from line 220. - The total magnetic field strength continued to decrease as the distance from the conductor increases. However, at 600 m, the trend changed. Why this change at 600 m?</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The work is scientifically sound considering the area of research implications (human radiation absorption). I find the paper publishable. However, authors should follow the review comments and the highlighted original manuscript and effect corrections.</p> <p>Finally, the number of citations in the work is minimal. A minimum of 10 authors should be cited for scientific paper of this nature.</p> <p>Standard referencing style should be followed. Authors are not consistent with work listed at the referencing list.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have follow VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Abubakar Yakubu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Physics, Kebbi University of Science &amp; Tech, Aliero, Nigeria</b>