



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.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	<p>In the paper, a new variant of G'/G-expansion method has been proposed and employed for a ZKBBM equation. This method may be interesting for some new solutions of nonlinear evolution equations and therefore deserves to be published. But before final acceptance, the authors should address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A detailed discussion should be made on the merits and demerits of the proposed method over the other variants of the G'/G methods. This can be done by comparing the solutions of the ZKBBM equation by G'/G method or its generalized form. 2. A brief note on the background and applicability of ZKMMB equation should be made. 3. Many authors contributed papers on G'/G methods, therefore some recent works should also be included in the reference list like A Malik, et al. Appl. Math. & Comp. 216, 2596-2612, (2010), A K Malik et al., Pramana-J. Phys. 78, 513-529, (2012), A K Malik et al., Comp. & Math. Appl. 78, 513-529, (2012) and some others. 4. From the generalized results of section three, it will be interesting to show whether these results can be reduced into some well known solutions of the problem derived by some other method 	<p>I have pointed out the new exact solutions, and compared them with the previous exact solutions.</p> <p>Through the deduction, I have given some ordinary exact solutions.</p> <p>I have added some references.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		