

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_95563
Title of the Manuscript:	Automorphism Groups of Regular Elements with Von-Neumann Inverses of Local near-rings admitting Frobenius Derivations
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)	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. Overall, the article is excellent. Very well written, detailed, with a clear proposal. Very didactic, and we see that the objectives are being achieved, one by one. 2. Yes. It is suitable. Although it seems too long, it needs to be complete to fully characterize the paper. 3. Yes. It is suitable. 4. Yes. The division is very harmonious. The paper as a whole is very well written and organized. 5. Naturally, it is not possible to verify all the mathematical developments in a short period of time. I myself am not an expert on the subject, so I express my opinion more about the structure of the text. The general structure suggests correct work. 6. Commenting references is sometimes a little difficult, as you don't always have access to all of them. I consider 6 references as an adequate amount for an article of this size.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. English is not my native language, so I have some difficulties with deeper issues associated with your grammar. But I believe that the text is on the same level of understanding as other academic works with which I am usually in contact.	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

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