

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_120508
Title of the Manuscript:	The Numerical Application of Dynamic Problems Involving Mass in Motion Governed by Higher Order Oscillatory Differential Equations
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 '**Jack 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper deals with an interesting topic. The discussion is acceptable. I recommend the paper for publication after a revision taking into account the following points.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, I think that the title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the abstract section, the aim, the methodology of the study, and the quantitative values of the results should be presented. Please rewrite the abstract section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is appropriate	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original points must be explained well. 2. Some of the old and less related works can be removed from the literature review and it can be updated using recent works. 3. Reinforce the governing equations and the boundary conditions with strong references. 4. Result section is poor. You should edit this section 5. Concluding remarks needs to be more précised and compact 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The main issue of this work is that the references are not up-to-date. The author needs to use the major references with the most recent work in this field.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language fine. No issues detected	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebhi Redha
Department, University & Country	University of Medea, Algeria