



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17528
Title of the Manuscript:	The First Mission of Iranian Spacecraft: Heat Shield Design
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>)



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	Changes which must be made before publication 1- The authors should provide the novel ideas of their work. 2- The literature review is very weak. Need to include more works. 3- It is recommended to give more details on the how they concentrate on improving the mathematical Model with the use of Theoretical Method. Is there any novel idea or not. 4- Conclusions should be more detailed and should give new ideas for further studies, instead of using repeating sentences in the body of the technical paper.	1. It is the first design of an Iranian spacecraft, and this geometry and flight mission is unique. The novelty is using the simple available industrial material to be used for thermal protecting application. It is mentioned in conclusion. 2. Some relative references are included. 3. There is no novelty in mathematical model. The method is general but is used for new industrial application. 4. It is revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In that light, the subject is important. The numerical methods must be carefully performed and must be well explained, though at some places it could be improved. This paper should be improved in the light of comments so that the quality of the paper is increased.	The paper is revised based on comments.