My comments to authors:

This paper presents mainly an unsteady natural convection boundary layer flow. The similarity solution method was used to solve heat and mass transfer boundary layer flow on a permeable flat plate. This research paper is an interesting piece of work and useful for the application of numerical study. The paper is generally well written and understandable however, it must be well organized. The mathematical model and its equations are right. But, the physical meanings of some figures were not clearly explained as mentioned above. The comparison with previous published articles for numerical verification must be necessary.

Based on the above mentioned reasons, I would like to recommend that this paper is publishable in British Journal of Applied Science & Technology after major revision.
## Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Compulsory REVIsion comments | 1. All the fonts used in the manuscript must be the same.  
2. The first sentence is incomplete at the section of governing equations.  
3. The boundary conditions are wrong in Eq.(7)  
4. Instead of unit less, dimensionless may be used.  
5. Equation number is wrong at the first sentences of section of numerical solutions. It must be “Equations (16)-(18)!! The equation number should be 12 instead of Eq.(1) at item 3 at the section of conclusion.  
6. The organization of the paper is not good; section six must include all of figures and Table 1.  
7. Instead of symbol alpha, the symbol equal must should be used in Eq.(27,28).  
8. Some parameters used in Figs. (3-5) must be the same for comparing with other figures. For example, the parameter lambda was taken for 1, 5 and 10 in Fig. (3). But, it was taken 1 and 2 in Fig. (4) and 2 and 5 in Fig.(5) . It must be same range and same values as a parameter to understand its effect to others. The same problem is the parameter E. It must be corrected.  
9. Detailed information and comparison with the earlier works must be given in this study. It is necessery a |
good benchmarking solution for the similar studies for validation and verifications.

10. It is necessary to give a physical explanation why a parameter changes when the other one is increased or decreased for all of the figures. Author showed his main findings without explanation of physical meanings. For example, when Gr is 20 why \( -f'(0) \) is -2.66720 in table. Because other values are positive for \( -f'(0) \). Why?

11. Result and discussion was repeated in conclusion. Conclusion is very poor and the section of conclusion must be rewritten as physical meaning of the main findings.

12. The effect of suction and injection on heat and mass transfer should be emphasized more in the text.

### Minor REVISION comments

13. Fig. (12) should be removed to the section of numerical solutions.

### Optional/General comments

14. Units must be placed in nomenclature.
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