

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_96245
Title of the Manuscript:	Clique Centrality and Global Clique Centrality of Graphs
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>Yes paper is a good contribution to the graph theory and clique.</p> <p>The title of paper is fine as per contents of the paper.</p> <p>The abstract can be improved as describing the problem first and then introducing the proposed method.</p> <p>The sections of the manuscript are fine. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct and discuss the clique centrality and global clique centrality in detail.</p> <p>The references are sufficient, the addition of recent articles published in 2022-23 will update the references to latest. Further the order of the references is not correct like 5 is appearing before 4, so authors may correct the same before publication.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is correct but final proofreading for the typo errors is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is very well written although it is short but discuss the main points hence can be published after minor changes as suggested.	

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:	Abdul Salam Shah
Department, University & Country	University of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia