



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_42962
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Thermal Conductivities of Some Selected Materials
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The title should be modified. 2- I can only say that the abstract may be enriched. There are no clear objectives mentioned in this article. The abstract is not well-written thus should be polished. 3- The manuscript needs to better organize and write. Present in-depth analysis and interpretation in connection to results. 4- Keywords should be chosen better than they are. 5- All abbreviations should be given in nomenclature list. 6- Introduction could be improved by adding more literature references related to article 7- No comparative results or conclusions are provided 8- The contributions should be more explicit. 9- Present in-depth analysis and interpretation in connection to results. 10- The explanation of figures and tables is insufficient. 11- More comparative interpretation could be expected in the paper. 12- In the Conclusions section, a brief overview of the results and the important numerical results of the work should be given. The findings in this section should be stated point by point. Thus, the conclusions of the present manuscript will be emphasized. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The title has been modified. 2- All the suggestions regarding the abstract have been effected with clear objectives stated and the abstract well polished. 3- In – depth analysis and interpretation of results have been carried out. Please see section 3.3 of the work. 4- Suggestion on keywords has been carried out. Please see “Keywords” in the manuscript. 5- There were no abbreviations used in this work as much as i know that were not explained. 6- The introduction has been improved upon. More references added and the whole section 1.0 of the work has been properly adjusted to meet the expectations/recommendations of the reviewers. Please see section 1.0 of the work. 7- Comparative results and conclusions have been provided. Please see first paragraph of section 4.0. 8- This has been carried out in the following sections: abstract, introduction, discussions and conclusion. 9- More explanations/discussions on figures and tables have been provided in section 3.3. 10- More explanations/discussions on figures and tables have been provided in section 3.3. 11- This has been carried out in sections 3.3 and 4.0 12- The conclusion has been re-written to address all the suggestions.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The writing quality needs substantial improvement	Writing quality has been improved upon.
----------------------------------	---	---

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	