



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_43567
Title of the Manuscript:	NATURAL CONVECTIVE HEAT TRANSFER IN A LAMINAR FLOW OVER AN IMMERSED CURVED SURFACE
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEACH PAPERS

**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	<p>The work entitled "NATURAL CONVECTIVE HEAT TRANSFER IN A LAMINAR FLOW OVER AN IMMERSSED CURVED SURFACE" does not clear the requirements very well to the scientific community in the present form. Please justify the significant requirements of present work to be classified as a manuscript on scientific or technological production.</p> <p>A schematic diagram is required for the present problem indicating different positions where the boundary conditions are applied. Also several positions of x are mentioned in the text as well as some figures. These positions needs to be detailed in the schematic diagram.</p> <p>The reviewer thinks English is not authors' first language. The quality of the language is needed to improve. Bad structure as well as bad punctuation in some sentences prevents proper understanding.</p> <p>Solutions of any numerical scheme is justified only if the sample results are validated against established results or experiments. However in this report the reviewer could not find any such qualitative or quantitative comparison. There is not any "Grid independence study" in the paper. No information about the treatment of the near wall layer. Most importantly no even a single point validation was presented for present model. How the reviewer/reader believes that the data presented in the paper are correct????????</p> <p>The quality of figures is insufficient, please redraw them all. Boundary conditions needs to be explained in detail. Where are they applied?</p> <p>Is it an unsteady or a steady simulation? If unsteady, the author must give more information about the modelling (solver, time step, physical time, scheme of pressure-velocity coupling etc.).</p> <p>The author describes the numerical methodology but does not mention the code used to perform the simulations.</p> <p>No units are present in the figures. Is any normalization carried out to convert the results to non-dimensional form? If yes, author(s) should share the specifics in the figures.</p> <p>In the results section, author(s) only indicate what they found from present work, but no clarification was given. Detailed discussions should be needed.</p> <p>For citation in text, please follow the standard reference style of the journal.</p> <p>Please, do a literature check of the papers published in recent years (2014 and even 2015) on flow over curved surface and relate the content of relevant papers to the results and findings presented in your publication. The reviewer suggests referring and citing the following works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2016. Numerical study on flow separation in 90° pipe bend under high Reynolds number by k-ε modelling. Engineering Science and Technology, an International Journal, 19(2), pp. 904-910.</li> <li>• 2015. Effect of Reynolds Number and Curvature Ratio on Single Phase Turbulent Flow in Pipe Bends. Mechanics and Mechanical Engineering, 19(1), pp.5-16.</li> <li>• 2015. Study on pressure drop characteristics of single phase turbulent flow in pipe bend for high Reynolds number. ARPN J. Eng. Appl. Sci, 10(5), pp.2221-2226.</li> </ul>	<p>I have done corrections on the manuscript as highlighted. Kindly check the schematic diagram for the fluid flow is indicated.</p> <p>The quality of language has been improved as in areas highlighted. Punctuation and structuring of sentences have been corrected and improved</p> <p>The whole manuscript has been subjected to antiplagiarism scan/ test and has been modified accordingly in highlighted areas.</p> <p>The discussion of the results have been organised well after each graph</p> <p>The matlab software was employed to get the solutions</p> <p>The detailed discussions are availed in the corrected manuscript</p> <p>Standard referencing has been done as highlighted in the manuscript</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		