



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_33067
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Prandtl number and Inclination angle on MHD Natural Convection in Inclined Open Square Cavity
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

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper needs the following major revisions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should be rewritten in a correct format. Don't write the subject applications in the abstract and it should present in the introduction part. The abstract should describe your problem and main key findings of your study only. 2. Don't write a parameter (eg., Pr) definition in the very beginning of the introduction part. The introduction starts with your problem applications and then the literature survey related to your present study and end with main objective of the present study. 3. The research methodology should be appear after the problem formulation. Because in the problem formulation only you define the governing equations so that the numerical technique present after the problem definition. 4. The right side wall boundary condition ($P=0$, $U=V$) is correct? 5. In the used heat transfer characteristics section, why you defined the Ra and Pr definition what is the need of these 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>parameters? You have to define only the local Nusselt and average Nusselt number in this section.</p> <p>6. There is lot of grammatical errors authors should correct them. Most of the sentences are not correctly formatted; go through the whole manuscript once again.</p> <p>7. All references should be present in the same format.</p> <p>8. The results and discussion part is very weak. Please include the physical significance in that section.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>N Nithyadevi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Mathematics, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, India</i>