

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_92716
Title of the Manuscript:	Non – commutativity over canonical suspension η for genus $g \geq 1$ in hypercomplex structures for potential $p \Phi$
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy>)

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>The idea and work behind the paper seems to be pretty sound and interesting</p> <p>The paper is not ok. It is suggested to correct its structure. The structuring of the paper is completely wrong. Even the references do not follow a proper referencing style. The equations used need to be better organised and their presentation improved. Finally the discussion needs to be rewritten. A good conclusion should be added to the end of the paper. Again why are the results stated at the start of the paper??? Normally these are put at the end.</p> <p>Kindly correct and greatly improve the layout of the paper!</p> <p>I am requesting that the author/s rewrite the paper in a better style and format. The equations need to be tidied up and improved. Why not use some form of numbering?</p> <p>Conclusions are a must.</p> <p>Add more references and improve the reference style.</p> <p>ALSO THERE ARE NO REFERENCES IN THE PAPER MAIN TEXT. KINDLY ADD THESE TOO!</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	More marks would have been given had the paper been in a better format. It needs to be redone from scratch. Although the work is good.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tony Spiteri Staines
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta