



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_50748
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical Study on Micropolar Nanofluid Flow over an Inclined Surface by Means of Keller-Box
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:

(<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	<p>1) The abstract is confuse, mainly, the definition of nanofluid. It should better written. In general, the text must be improved, doing a rigorous English proofing.</p> <p>2) The lines 35 and 36 of the Introduction are written in a different font</p> <p>3) The text at lines 37 and 38 is without sense: 'Nanofluid flow over a slanted extending surface concentrated by Sandeep and Kumar [5].'</p> <p>4) The legibility of Figures is poor. Improve it.</p>	<p>We thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her careful reading of our manuscript and their many insightful comments and suggestions. We respond to the comments of each reviewer in detail, with reviewer comments in coloured form in the revised manuscript. We are providing a revised manuscript that reflects his/her suggestions and comments.</p> <p>Q1. Answer: Revised the abstract and improved the English along with nanofluid definition.</p> <p>Q2. Answer: Changed the font in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Q3. Answer: Corrected in the Revised manuscript.</p> <p>Q4. Answer: Improved in the revised manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

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