|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | **Mathematical Modeling the Reflection and Transmission of Magneto-Thermoelastic Waves and Propagation of Surface Waves** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_2922** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **Mathematical Modeling the Reflection and Transmission of Magneto-Thermoelastic Waves and Propagation of Surface Waves and Their Applications** |
| Type of the Article | **Complete Book** |

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This Book’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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

|  |
| --- |
| PART 1: Review Comments |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript offers significant contributions to the scientific community. Because models presented in this study can benefit practical applications, including petroleum extraction and industrial processes where wave propagation plays a key role​. However, there is a lack of apprehension even if numerous topics are addressed here. The arrangement of the topics is inadequate, leading to challenges in comprehension. Consequently, despite the presence of many intriguing informations, the overall impression of the manuscript is mediocre. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | No.Proposed Title:Propagation of Surface Waves and Magneto-Thermoelastic Waves: A Mathematical Model of Reflection and Transmission |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The article has no abstract. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The manuscript appears well-structured, covering essential aspects of the research. It includes sections like: Introduction, Problem Formulation, Chapters.However, here are a few suggestions: 1. Some sections, especially those discussing similar theories or results (e.g., thermoelasticity models, wave propagation), appear repetitive. Condensing these overlapping sections will improve the flow.2. Summary or Conclusion Section: A brief conclusion at the end of each major chapter would help in summarizing key results, making it easier for readers to follow the progression of the work. |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The graphical representations provide solid evidence for the theoretical results, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are based on well-founded scientific principles. Overall, the research is methodologically sound and adheres to established scientific frameworks. However, there are some areas that require improvement. Chapter six would benefit from additional graphical presentations. Chapter eight lacks sufficient detail and should be expanded. Chapter nine would be enhanced by the inclusion of concluding remarks. Chapter ten ends abruptly without a clear conclusion. The results obtained in chapter eleven are unclear, and it is not evident whether the work was done numerically or analytically. Additionally, two different results appear in chapter twelve, indicating that one should be renamed as chapter thirteen. Conclusions are provided for some chapters, but a general conclusion is also included, which is sufficient.  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The section titled "List of published work" should be renamed "References." The section "List of published work". The section titled "List of Published Work" is not up to date. More recent publications should be included to reflect the latest advancements and contributions in the field.  |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and overall quality of English in the article should be improved. |  |
| Optional/General comments | NA |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Reviewer Details: |
| Name: | **Anonymous reviewer (Only for this stage as per Review policy)** |
| Department, University & Country |  |