



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The 2nd copy of the paper has improved but still needs more justifications and answers about the big difference between the values of T_c in the Table, discussions on HTSC materials and the scope of study: metals and oxides. The new model/ theory must generate values near to experimental values and this point is note met in the paper. Other remarks such as Kelvin is K and not k, reference to fig.2, reference of eqns 1-4 and completion of reference 6. My suggestion to the author is: First of all explain how did you reach fig.2 and is it performed for each material? Then try to discuss the materials who do not obey your model where the discrepancy is big? Why other materials in Table 1 are in a good agreement with experimental values? So the paper is pending until the above points are met.	1. We added some sentence in this version. 2. If we hope to get more precision data, we have to use the more complicated model to calculate. We gave three basic methods in the appendix to show how improve the calculation precision. 3. We add some sentence to discuss the deviation between our result and the data in the literature in this version. 4. K has been changed to K in this version. 5. Reference 6 has been Modified in this version.