

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_92481
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Transverse Loading on a Beam Utilizing the Beltrami-Michell Equations
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>The aim of this paper is to study the stress field of a beam with a circular cross-section have been developed in the current work. One end of the beam is fixed while the other end is under traverse load at its center. The Beltrami-Michell compatibility equations were utilized to obtain coefficients in an assumed stress function which can be used to derive the stress field. To visualize the stress distribution in the beam, one can use MATLAB to generate surface plots and contour plots for the developed stress field. Moreover, the goal of this paper is to prove that any stress function with higher order terms will always converge to the same stress solution for the beam utilizing lower order terms.. However, the followings should be carefully addressed in the revision to be published in the Physical Science International Journal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The authors should be followed the instruction of the journal in all parts and sections in this manuscript. 2- Try to decrease the manuscript page numbers. 3- In general, this manuscript presents literature survey different published papers, which use various types of passive tapes that can improve hydrothermal performance as compared with smooth pipe. However, the structure of this article resembles the literature review chapter for any thesis and it is unlike the conventional organization of review papers. Abstract: authors need to raise the main purpose of this investigation, as well as the key findings observed by the authors. Therefore, to be more excited, they have to rewrite it with coherent writing. 4- The abstract needs more quantitative results. The abstract section is an important and powerful representation of the research. It is better that the results should be presented with the support of specified data. 5- Most tables and figures are needed improve the quality of all tables and figures. 6- Add different heat transfer equations for calculating overall heat performance and add references for all equations. 7- Please provide more information regarding sensitive analysis. 8 Improve work justification. 9- I would also suggest including in the conclusion section 10- The conclusion need more improvement. 11- The conclusion section on lacks in summative conclusions. Moreover, are the results obtained in this paper really applicable in other similar researches? 12- In the discussion development, it is very important to emphasize points of agreement or disagreement between results in this work and others cited in references part of manuscript. 13- Authors should discuss limitations of the current study and possible improvements for future directions/research works. 14- Authors did not illustrate the key aim and objectives of this survey and they did not provide any summarized table for the significant parameters. 15- Finally, I recommend the author to read through the whole text and correct it to make it more reader-friendly. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Ramadhan Al-Obaidi
Department, University & Country	Mustansiriyah University, Iraq