

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_100598
Title of the Manuscript:	The complexity of wheel graphs with multiple edges and vertices
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. I think that every manuscript intended for scientific dissemination should have its publication encouraged. I consider the topic interesting for publication and discussions.</p> <p>2. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. It is suitable. In the key words, "number of spanning trees" would be preferable to "the number of spanning tress".</p> <p>4. The division is harmonious and the paper as a whole is very well structured. I especially like the inclusion of a concluding chapter.</p> <p>5. Naturally, it is not possible to verify all the mathematical developments in a short period of time, so I express my opinion more about the structure of the text. The general structure suggests correct work. However, here I must highlight an important aspect, which is related to the difficulty of accessing the references cited in the article. I had no way to check in ref [5] about the method obtained by Feussner (there are no more details in the article, so I couldn't distinguish exactly which Feussner the author is referring to). I suggest that the aforementioned iterative formula be better explained, or at least that other references leading to it be indicated.</p> <p>6. Commenting references is sometimes a little difficult, as you don't always have access to all of them. I consider 08 references as an adequate amount for an article of this size. With regard to publication dates, this is not important in a work of pure mathematics.</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, 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.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest that Feussner's Iterative Formula is better explained in the development of the paper, because it is one of the central points of the work.</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