

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98744
Title of the Manuscript:	An Error Analysis of Implicit Finite Difference Method with Mamadu-Njoseh Basis Functions for Time Fractional Telegraph Equation
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> It is a worthwhile contribution, with a comprehensive introduction.</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The title is cumbersome and should be simplified.</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes. Well done.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Yes</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>I can make a few points.</p> <p>1. In the problem definition, the author uses an alpha and a beta. Are they the same? Otherwise, the statement has little meaning.</p> <p>2. The Introduction has monstrous-sized paragraphs. If the author wants anyone to read this paper, these paragraphs should be split into several smaller paragraphs.</p> <p>3. If the <math>\  \cdot \ </math>-norm is always used, the authors should state that, or use correct notation.</p> <p>4. Is the statement an definition or a conclusion?</p> <p>5. In Section 2, we find the line "where <math>\phi</math> and <math>\psi</math> satisfies [24]". But, [24] is a reference and not an equation in this paper. Better fix.</p> <p>6. In Lemma 1, it is stated that: For <math>\phi</math> be defined by <math>\phi</math>. Never is given a definition of the other values of <math>h</math>. Are we to refer to some other paper?</p> <p>7. I suggest this paper, except for the Abstract, is rather sloppily written without sufficient attention to detail. Just a few lines of explanation in several places could make quite a difference in the quality of the presentation. Please encourage the authors to do so.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	G Donald Allen
Department, University & Country	Texas A&M University, USA