



## SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_45057
Title of the Manuscript:	2D-simulation of Nanopowder High-Speed Compaction
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Nanopowder compaction has potential wide application in the future material making and fabrication. However, lack the experimental varication is the weakness of the paper, if possible, I suggest author do some experiments to verify the theoretical model.</p> <p>Besides the above mentioned, there are still some grammar errors and unclear figures in the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. P1 line 30 article? Or particle? Please make sure this word</li> <li>2. P1 line 32 "However at that quasistatic compaction processes are investigated, " can I replaced this sentence by "However at that quasistatic compaction processes are still to be investigated"</li> <li>3. P2, line57, what is <math>r</math> in equation (2)</li> <li>4. P2 line 71 "implied" should be rewrote as "used"</li> <li>5. p2 line 45 densification rate "<math>v</math>" should be different with line p2 line 72 Poisson ratio <math>v</math>.</li> <li>6. P3 Fig.1 is unclear. Fig.2-4 is the same as Fig.1</li> <li>7. P4 Table 1, please keep the number of decimal consistent, such as 9.257 and 10.0;</li> <li>8. P5 line 183, where <math>p</math> in Eq.(7) is <math>p(h)</math> or not?</li> </ol>	<p>We have agreed with reviewer, corrected the manuscript and highlighted corresponding parts in the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. P1, line 30: the word "powders" has been replaced by "particles".</li> <li>2. P1, line 32: Yes. The sentence has been replaced.</li> <li>3. P2, line 57: the text required has been added after eq. (1).</li> <li>4. P2, line 71: the word "implied" has been replaced by "used".</li> <li>5. P2, line 45: Poisson ratio has been denoted as <math>v_p</math> throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>6. Figures. All figures have been reprinted with higher resolution (600 dpi) and simplified (the number of lines depicted have been reduced).</li> <li>7. Table 1. The number of decimal is evened.</li> <li>8. P5, line 183: Yes. Eq. (7) has been corrected.</li> </ol> <p>We are grateful to the Referees for the valuable remarks, which have allowed us to improve the quality of the paper.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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