

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_126498
Title of the Manuscript:	New Explicit Exact Solutions for the (1+1) Dimensional Generalized Short Water Wave Equation
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of the current manuscript is interesting and scientifically sound. I like this manuscript because the stated model is important to more applicable different areas such as fluid dynamics, nonlinear optic and others. Authors should be addressed some following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Why does the author consider this model? What are the real applications for this model? ➤ Why we are doing and what we are doing? Please mention it. Authors should be re-examining and organize the text like as background of the study, application of the model, research gap of the study, aim and objectives of the study. Then, the manuscript will understand clearly by readers. ➤ Motivation is missing! 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is OKAY!	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is very poor. Authors should be rewrite and included more information or main key points.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Paper organization is not so good. Author should be rewrite and organized the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What is α and β in the stated model? Please clarify it? Is there any limitation? ➤ What is μ? ➤ The methodology section needs to be more detailed and clearly explain the steps of the improved methods. What are the advantages of the selected methods? Please clarify it. ➤ Result and discussion improve with application point of view like as fluid dynamics, shallow water waves and others. Please plot all figures with high resolution and nature of the wave profile should be added in caption. ➤ Author should be added impact of α and β in the revise manuscript. 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ How to get new solution of the manuscript? Please explain it. ➤ The author did not compare his results with others from literature. Please explain and comments it. ➤ Author need to mention briefly with application of present work in real world, what is new in this model and why is it considered? ➤ How to choose the values of parameter, explain? ➤ Conclusion and abstract should be rewritten after including new outcomes. The reviewer believes that the paper will be more attractive and informative if it makes sure, what is the new contribution of this study and also future scope? ➤ Arrange all references according to journal style in a consistent manner. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Literature review is lack. So, authors should be revised with addition of higher-dimensional models in soliton theory in introduction section, it should be adding some recent literatures to emphasize as follows: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2024.06.079 https://doi.org/10.3329/ganit.v44i1.73987 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.padiff.2023.100584; https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-62113-z; https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0300435; https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218863524500097; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2024.107536 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11082-023-05783-9; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.padiff.2023.100561; https://doi.org/10.1515/phys-2023-0104; https://doi.org/10.1007/s40819-023-01503-9; https://doi.org/10.1007/s11082-024-06289-8; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2023.106620; https://doi.org/10.1016/j.padiff.2023.100573; 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The whole manuscript should be checked for typos and grammatical errors. An overall review is needed to fix the grammatical and typographical errors in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Islam S M Rayhanul
Department, University & Country	Pabna University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh