SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/PRRI/2209
Title of the Manuscript:	New (G'/G)-expansion method and its applications to nonlinear PDE

General guideline for Peer Review process: (Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)

- Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.
- Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)
- Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)
- Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.
- We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if gareed with reviewer
		correct the manuscript and highlight that part in
		the mean suite this way data as the south and
		the manuscript. It is manaatory that authors
		should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	In this paper, authors directly apply well known and	
	applied (G'/G) -expansion method to construct	
	exact solutions of nonlinear evolution equation so	
	called the Zakharov-Kuznetsov-	
	Benjamin-Bona-Mahony (ZKBBM) equation with the	
	aid of symbolic computation By using this method	
	they claim that they obtained many new and more	
	general exact solutions of the equation But it is not	
	general exact solutions of the equation. But it is not	
	clear that which solutions are new solutions and which	
	are previously obtained by other methods and exist in	
	the literature. This is very important because, if the	
	obtained solutions are already exist in the literature	
	what is the use of finding them once more! Authors	
	must make this distinction on their manuscript	
	Otherwise, it would be a work of graduate student but	
	noting.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<i>NOTE: Should be checked by</i> iThenticate if available.	
	, <u> </u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Turgut Öziş
Department, University & Country	Ege University, Science Faculty, Mathematics Dept., Turkey