



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_10290
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Retarding Force on Mass Flow Rates of Fluid at Different Temperatures Using Software Visualization Technique
Type of the Article	Review 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This paper reports to develop a mathematical model with software visualization technique to view the effects of retarding forces on the mass flow rate. Basically, this paper is not well organized and not well written. Many grammatical errors occur in the article. This paper has a serious English issue. The citations in the “References” are quite limited. Some major comments are shown as following. 1. For international readers to quickly catch your contribution, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them, in a clearer way in abstract and introduction. 2. The authors should specify the parameters of the mathematical model and clearly describe the inputs and outputs. 3. The authors present many figures and long tables which should be reorganized. Long tables (Tables 3.1~3.4) should be avoided. 4. The discussions to the figures and tables are	All the parameters used in this paper were properly named. E.g. p = density, k = density viscosity. The figures has been re discussed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	poor. 5. The quality of figures should be more improved. 6. The Conclusion section has not summarized the results, major finding and contrubutions.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		