



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13530
Title of the Manuscript:	A Simple Mechanism For Superconductivity
Type of the Article	Short 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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author(s) has presented 4 different cases in which a material could exhibit the behaviour of superconductivity. The reviewer acknowledges the author's effort on his theoretical findings in superconductivity. However, there is no experimental evidence to support his theoretical findings. Besides, the paper has not been very well presented. The reviewer hopes that the author could revise the English in the paper. Variables were not defined in the paper. There is difficulty trying to understand the variables in the equations.	1. we already discussed four situations, but only in one case, the material will show superconductivity. 2. The data in this work are in the acceptable range of experimental data. We also added some comment in this new version. 3. This version should meet your verbal requirement. 4. in this version, the variables are defined clearly. Thanks for your valuable time and good questions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	competing interest:- - Yes. Superconductivity has been a popular research topic.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	