

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_96739
Title of the Manuscript:	Laminar Plumes from a Line Source and Their Possible Flow Behaviours.
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) It is very important to provide a visualization of the laminar flow pattern 2) yes, the title is attractive and suitable 3) The abstract has been carefully reviewed and includes the background, objectives, methods and results and conclusions of the research 4) yes, it is appropriate 5) after reading the review of this manuscript, I think that this manuscript is scientifically feasible 6) I think that more than 60% of the references used by the author are very up-to-date, because they were published in the last 10 years.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think the quality of the English language of this article is suitable for scientific communication	
Optional/General comments	Many scientific data and information about laminar flow patterns can be obtained from the results of this study.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Godlief Fredrik Neonufa
Department, University & Country	Artha Wacana Christian University, Indonesia