

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98197
Title of the Manuscript:	Three-Step Four-Point Optimized Hybrid Block Method for Direct Solution of General Third Order Differential Equations
Type of the 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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) YES 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Nearly 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? YES 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? YES 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? YES 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)	1. This manuscript is nice for scientific community and it was carefully prepared. 2. The title of the article is suitable 3. The abstract is comprehensive, but there is a typo in it. Please check it. 4. The structure of the manuscript is OK, but it needs a better type-setting. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are minor grammar mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is good and proposed to publish after correcting those minor grammar mistakes.	

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:	Xingbo Wang
Department, University & Country	Foshan University, China