



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Physical Science International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_PSIJ_55163 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Influence of the water nature on the two-phase flow in an air-lift column |
| 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>)

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 | | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Minor Changes are required for publication</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the abstract, the authors need to summarize clearly the problem to be addressed, objectives, methodology, briefly point out the main results they obtained. Remove grammatically mistakes. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the Introduction, the authors need to describe not only what was done in previous works, i.e. it is also necessary to stress the main results of each of them, otherwise the reader will not properly understand how the present work compares to the state-of-the-art on the subject. Once the state-of-the-art is characterized, the authors should state the objectives of their work based on what lacks to be done in the subject, emphasizing its novelty and possible answers to open questions; Include novelty of the work Include some examples and practical applications. Modified and improve introduction with some recent research. <p>Formulation/Main problem</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Include physical model of the flow. What is the physical meaning of the problem? Where this work can be useful? Write about the software used in this paper <p>Results discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compare your results with previous work. Write the conclusion more precious. The authors should do a better job on commenting the results. A reasonable physical explanation should be provided for the observed trends, not only report what is graphically seen in the Figures; There are so many errors that makes it difficult to follow the manuscript. There are many words missing and many sentences unfinished especially in the abstract, introduction and conclusion part. The authors also need to specifically describe the exact contribution of their work compared to many published works What is the main difference between this article and the articles published previously? | |
| 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> | |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | <i>Abdul Samad Khan</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Northwestern Polytechnical University, China</i> |