



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_40076
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Axial Couette Flow in Annular Region of Abruptly Stopped Pipes
Type of the Article	Original research paper

**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>)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authors are requested to check the duration of study.</li> <li>2. In abstract section it is not clear to me that the authors derived the exact solution for what? "<i>where we derived the exact solution for by Laplace transformation method</i>"</li> <li>3. Authors should highlight the final solution/equation/findings of their exact solution method.</li> <li>4. Authors should justify how it could be assumed as an "exact solution" without having any comparison of their results (method) with established data.</li> <li>5. Why pressure term is not considered throughout the study?</li> <li>6. Honestly, boundary condition part is not very clear to me. For example, what types of BC is applied near the wall (slip/no-slip) is not presented.</li> <li>7. Is the authors considered power low fluid throughout their study?</li> <li>8. The figure quality is very poor. It is very difficult to understand the axis title in some figures.</li> <li>9. Positions where data were taken is not clear.</li> <li>10. If the data presented in figures are in normalized/non-dimensional form, then it should be clearly indicated in axis title/legends/figure captions etc.</li> <li>11. There was no validation of present numerical work. How it could be considered that the data presented here is efficient enough?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corrected and highlighted in the text.</li> <li>2. We derived the exact solution, that is the velocity of the field. Indicated this in the text.</li> <li>3. Equation is given.</li> <li>4. We did not compare the analytical solution with numerical solution. Because it is a time taking process to do the programming for analytical part.</li> <li>5. Mentioned in the text and highlighted.</li> <li>6. Indicated in the text and highlighted.</li> <li>7. The flow was initially considered as laminar and the abrupt changes of wall movement will change the flow to transition or non-laminar. Which was not carried out in this study and mentioned in the text.</li> <li>8. Figure quality was checked and changed some figures in the manuscript.</li> <li>9. Mentioned and included a figure and highlighted in the text.</li> <li>10. Mentioned in the figure caption and highlighted.</li> <li>11. We did not check the efficiency of numerical work. Its for the flow visualization.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		