

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_95112
Title of the Manuscript:	Attractors and numerical simulations for a two-temperature phase transition system
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:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Heat conduction behaviour study is important area for the current research domain and its application is vast in several real time purposes. Numerical solutions, experimentations and computational fields are giving the brief idea about the temperature variations as well as heat transfers.</p> <p>2. Better to add type of numerical method used for the current study in the title.</p> <p>3. Abstract is not clear. There is lack of explanation or background. Results are not discussed in the abstract. Suggested to keep minimum 250-300 words in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Structure of the paper is not good. Literature is not sufficient. No clear explanation in any of the sections. Only equations are written without explaining the nomenclatures.</p> <p>5. Study is good. But by reading the paper a common man couldn't understand the theory behind it.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but references are to be discussed in depth.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need to be improved.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract need to be revised. • Literature is not sufficient. • Results need more explanation. • Conclusion of the study is required. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sushanth H Gowda
Department, University & Country	Visvesvaraya Technological University, India