

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2176
Title of the Manuscript:	Solution of SPL Heat Conduction Model under Neumann Boundary Condition
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	Conduction is one of the basic forms of heat transfer. The main drawback of the classical Fourier's law is that it assumes the temperature gradient is established with an infinite speed when the Neumann boundary condition is employed. Modeling and solution of the single-phase-lagging (SPL) conduction problem is very important for materials of micro or nano scales, where thermal damage resulted from transient temperature peak could happen during heating. The reviewer believes the topic of this manuscript is interesting to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The reviewer believes the title is appropriate regarding the contents.	
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 reviewer believes the abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The reviewer believes that manuscript is well structured.	
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 manuscript proves of reasonable quality and credibility. The modeling and solution approaches, as well as numerical scheme are detailed. The results are credible and the analysis of the results is well conducted. However, the reviewer suggests focusing more on the physical interpretation of the data than description of the graphs. It would be helpful to draw a stronger conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references listed in the manuscript are suitable and up-to-date.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In overall, the style and quality of English writing areacceptable for academic communication.	
Optional/Generalcomments	Generally, the manuscript is interesting and has good potential.	

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:	Hang Pu
Department, University & Country	School of Energy and Power Engineering, Dalian University of Technology, China