

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMCS_109519</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Magnetohydrodynamic Nonlinear Radiative Heat and Mass Transfer Flow of Sisko nanofluid through a Nonlinear Stretching Sheet in The Presence of Chemical Reaction</b>
Type of the Article	

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript falls in the scope of the journal, however, I suggest the following revision to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Manuscript contains some typo errors that can be fixed in the revised version for running a spell check.</li> <li>2. The abstract should be briefly written to describe the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major findings. Authors should revise it.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* one sentence to present the significance of the study,</li> <li>* one sentence to present the aim of the study,</li> <li>* one sentence to present the research methodology, and</li> <li>* two sentences to present the conclusion drawn from the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. How did nanoparticles influence the fluid flow?</li> <li>4. What types of nanoparticles are used here?</li> <li>5. Please clarify the size of the nanoparticles.</li> <li>6. The originality of the paper needs to be stated clearly. For instance, in introduction section can be more critical and concise, at the moment a lot of information but no critical observation can be observed.</li> <li>7. It is of importance to have sufficient results to justify the novelty of a high-quality journal paper. What is the novelty of this study?</li> <li>8. The result and discussion section is the main weakness of your study and needs to be improved a lot. Physical justification behind the results must be provided for each and every graph. Authors have mentioned only the increasing/decreasing trend of the curves.</li> <li>9. Authors may include the following closely related Analysis of Carreau fluid flow by convectively heated disk with viscous dissipation effects , Entropy production in the swirling flow of viscous nanofluid over a stretching cylinder embedded in a porous medium, Melting heat transfer by forced convection of Sisko fluid, Induced magnetic field analysis for the peristaltic transport of non-Newtonian nanofluid in an annulus, Ciliary motion phenomenon of viscous nanofluid in a curved channel with wall properties, Effects of nanoparticles on the peristaltic motion of tangent hyperbolic fluid model in an annulus Analysis of Nanoparticles on Peristaltic Flow of Prandtl Fluid Model in an Endoscopy</li> <li>10. Improve the captions of the figures in order to indicate clearer what is plotted?</li> <li>11. Governing equations are modeled without any prior reference.</li> <li>12. The conclusion part is weak. It's hard for readers to get useful information about this study. Write the conclusion more precious.</li> <li>13. Fix the size of the figures.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hina Sadaf</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Sciences and Technology, Pakistan</b>