

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_96871
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical modeling of the effect of the ratio of thermal conductivity on the thin film condensation in forced convection in a canal whose walls are covered with a porous material
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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, as the authors suggested, there has been a new modeling developed that analyzed the impact of the thermal conductivity ratio on longitudinal velocity, temperature, film thickness, thermal transfer rate at the porous medium/liquid film interface (local Nusselt number), and finally entry length. 2. Yes, it is. 3. Yes, it is. 4. Yes, they are. 5. Yes, I do 6. Yes, they are.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	No 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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudad Hameed AL-Obaidi
Department, University & Country	Saint Petersburg State Mining University, Sweden