

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98521
Title of the Manuscript:	A New Algorithm to determine Adomian Polynomials for nonlinear polynomial functions
Type of the Article	Method 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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents a simple new algorithm for determining the Adomian Polynomials for scalar-valued nonlinear polynomials. It makes a comparison of efficiency with other similar algorithms, viz., Duan's Corollaries 1 & 2 Algorithms. Given that the algorithm seems to record more computational successes in areas where the former failed, I would say the manuscript is important to the scientific community. Besides, it's well-written. I must commend the author, as this makes peer-reviewing less arduous.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript. However, the author may consider throwing in the word 'scalar' especially if the vector case can't be deduced directly from their method,</p> <p>3. Yes, succinct, and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient but not so recent. Can the author review about 5 recent articles on the topic and compare their result with the trends? By recent, I mean work on the topic published after 2017, inclusive. The more the recent the better.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christian Nwachioma
Department, University & Country	University of Colorado, United States