



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	"A simple mechanism of superconductivity" for the refereeing,, I feel In science we are doing an effort to prove, or at least support, our ideas or arguments. Such background does not exist, in my opinion, in the paper: the formulae with which the calculations of the data presented in a single Table of the paper are not given, the results obtained there, mostly very strange, are not discussed, the references 7-9 are not available, at least to me. My conclusion is evidently negative.	1. we do present the equations in paper for the calculation of Transition temperature, furthermore, we also demonstrate how to determine the transition temperature by illustration in figure 2. 2. The data in this work are still in the range of the experimental data from literature. 3. The reference 7-8 are easier to get from the website and library. In this version we delete the reference 9 in old version. If the reviewer still can't get these references, then we can download and send over by email.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		