

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_96163
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EXTENSION OF DIAGRAM GROUP OVER SEMIGROUP PRESENTATION
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)
<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. I think that every manuscript intended for scientific dissemination should have its publication encouraged. See here a well-intentioned work that deserves such publicity. The article is of good quality, well written and interesting. It just needs a few tweaks as per subsequent reviews.</p> <p>2. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. It is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. I do not approve of the division. If there is only one section, it would not need to be numbered. That is, there is a section 1, but no section 2. I suggest doing the following: 1. Introduction; 2. Determining the two complex graphs; 3. Conclusion (to be included). A concluding chapter is always important, showing what was obtained from the results and announcing prospects for future works.</p> <p>5. I am not an expert in the research area of the article, and I have tried to limit my remarks to its structure. But the general structure suggests correct work.</p> <p>6. Commenting references is sometimes a little difficult, as you don't always have access to all of them. I consider 17 references an adequate number for a paper of this size. Reference dates are not an important point in a work of pure mathematics. In addition, all are relatively recent, with the oldest dating back to 1985.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is not my native language, and therefore I am not familiar with all its grammatical subtleties. However, I can say that the English of the article is at the same level as that of several other works that I have already had the opportunity to read/review.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I am attaching the manuscript, with some highlights in yellow. I know that the formatting is not yet in its definitive form, but I would like you to pay attention to some details.</p> <p>1. In the abstract, Finally, with a capital letter.</p> <p>2. In the heading in section 1, write graphs instead of graph.</p> <p>3. Avoid separating math expressions during newlines. I highlighted some examples. There are several other similar cases.</p> <p>4. Check the formatting of the references, as in the case of ref [17] .</p> <p>5. Pay attention to the section division suggestion, indicated in item 4 of "Compulsory revision".</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Simal Moreira
Department, University & Country	UniFOA – Centro Universitário de Volta Redonda, Brazil