SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AIR_11625**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Heat transfer and solidification of molten iron in a pipe**
Type of the Article	**Research**

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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Introduction is too long comparing with results and discussion.** **You should improve your results section.** **Flow modelling in pipe is very usual case for fluid flow area, you should describe your results with much deep considerations.** - **You mentioned "frozen", but frozen and solidified are different.** - **Your results with temperature and velocity are not enough to explain your iron process.** - **I do not understand why you should do this modelling. I could not catch your purpose. (Usually, with low wall temperature, the solidification in pipe truly exists.)** - **Do you want to find optimum wall temperature for iron process?** - **You should verify your purpose of this research.** - **Your calculation the correct model for solicitation should be defined in the section of "numerical Solution"** - **How you verify the solidification process in your calculation? (by temperature or velocity?)**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer