

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_103447
Title of the Manuscript:	The Physical Application of Motion Using Single Step Block Method
Type of the 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>This document deals with the study of a problem that presents some interest.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In order to improve this document, I would like to indicate to the author or authors some aspects that, in my opinion, need to be reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) In the introduction, it would be interesting if the objectives of this research were clearly specified. Also, with the reader in mind, it would be appropriate to briefly describe how the document is organized. (ii) In subsection 3.1. It would be convenient to include some reference on which the developments presented are based. In addition, the writing of equation (3.3) should be reviewed. (iii) In the conclusions, it might be interesting to include some comment on future work that can be derived, either from a theoretical point of view or from an applied point of view, from the methodology proposed in this paper. 	

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:	Francisco Martínez González
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic University of Cartagena, Spain