



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_42783
Title of the Manuscript:	An elastic-plastic finite element analysis of two interfering hemispheres sliding in frictionless contact
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>)

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	NIL	
Minor REVISION comments	NIL	
Optional/General comments	The work is excellent . The paper is quite lengthy but very informative research work. Some suggestions: Para 2, page 3: <i>It is concluded that none of the previous works investigates the sliding phenomenon between two interfering hemispheres as reported herein</i> - suggested to revise the sentence, concluded word looks not suitable here. Page 43, Line 5 from bottom: <i>.....approximate solution at that.</i> - incomplete sentence.	Para 2, page 3: "It is concluded..." is replaced by "Seemingly..." Page 43, line 5: "... approximate solution at that." Is replaced by "...approximate solution."