

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_102678
Title of the Manuscript:	Maximum Linear Forest of Graphs Resulting from Some Binary Operations
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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It is important for scientific community</p> <p>2. Maximum Linear Forest of Graphs Resulting union and join of graphs</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. NO. (see main text)</p> <p>5. There are missing links necessary for the determination the scientific correctness</p> <p>6. They are insufficient and grossly obsolete and majorly incomplete</p> <p>It is obvious that the manuscript is not self-sustaining in terms of the cross references made.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The missing cross references should be provided so that the correctness of the manuscript can be ascertained to a reasonable degree. Also the numbering of theorems, lemmas, propositions should be revisited and a chronological pattern adopted.	

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madu, Cletus Ifeanyi
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Education, Nigeria