



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_PSIJ_18598
Title of the Manuscript:	Solitary Wave Solutions to the Strain Wave Equation in Microstructured Solids through the Modified Simple Equation Method
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors said in the abstract and the conclusions that: "If the balance number is greater than one, in general the MSE method does not provide any solution. For this case, we have established the procedure in order to implement the MSE method to solve NLEEs for balance number two".</p> <p>This fact is not true. The authors do not provide any new procedure, but he used the same procedure which is called "the modified simple equation method" proposed in [35-39] and has been corrected in the following paper: A note on the modified simple equation method applied to Sharma-Tasso-Olver equation" Applied Mathematics and Computation 218(2011) 3962-3964, which not cited here.</p> <p>There are a lot of papers used this method where the balance number is greater than one which are not cited here. I feel that the authors have minimal idea about the recent publications in this field because there are a lot of published papers where the balance number is two.</p> <p>Further, the authors obtained some real solutions and some complex solutions. In physics the complex solutions have no meaning.</p>	<p>Response: In this article, we have claimed that "If the balance number is greater than one, in general the MSE method does not provide any solution. For this case, we have established the procedure in order to implement the MSE method to solve NLEEs for balance number two", but the reviewer comments that "This fact is not true. The authors do not provide any new procedure, but he used the same procedure which is called "the modified simple equation method" proposed in [35-39] and has been corrected in the following paper: A note on the modified simple equation method applied to Sharma-Tasso-Olver equation" Applied Mathematics and Computation 218(2011) 3962-3964, which not cited here. There are a lot of papers used this method where the balance number is greater than one which are not cited here".</p> <p>We do not agree with these comments of the reviewer. Perhaps the reviewer did not get on to the specific contents. Earlier by the MSE method only two equations (see Ref. [47] and [48]) have been solved. One of which the solution does not satisfy the equation and in the other article there are instructions, which we have mentioned in our article in the second paragraph of introduction and highlighted by yellow colour. But, in this article, we have solved the strain wave equation in microstructured solids whose the balance number is two by means of the MSE method and have given a complete guideline how one can solve other NLEEs when the balance number is two. By this time using this guideline we have solved some other NLEEs whose balance number is two.</p> <p>On the other hand, the reviewer in his report demands that "There are a lot</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>of papers used this method where the balance number is greater than one which is not cited here.” This is completely a misinformation; we strongly oppose to this statement of the reviewer. Till now only two equations are solved by the MSE method whose balanced number is two and in the revised manuscript we have cited these two articles. If there are lots of papers used this method where the balance number is two, why the reviewer did not mention a few of them as example?</p> <p>Interestingly the reviewer claims that “I feel that the authors have minimal idea about the recent publications in this field because there are a lot of published papers where the balance number is two”.</p> <p>We think that, the reviewer has minimal idea about balance number and different methods to examine exact solitary wave solutions. We would like to say strongly that, lots of NLEEs have been solved whose balance number is two by other methods, like (G'/G)-expansion method, exp-function method, tanh-function method, Adomian decomposition method, sine-cosine method etc., NOT by MSE method.</p> <p>We agree to the last comment of the reviewer; in physics complex solutions have no meaning. In the revised manuscript, we have re-written the solutions and avoid the complex solutions.</p> <p>In the revised manuscript, the grammatical and typographical errors have also been corrected thoroughly.</p> <p>The revised manuscript has been submitted to the journal. We look forward to your positive response.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		