

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the scientific community by obtaining analytical results to the generalized wave equation. By using three different schemes, the authors succeed in obtaining a variety of solutions. The comparison of these methods and the use of graphical analysis to interpret solution characteristics enhance the study's quality, making it an important addition for future investigation in applied mathematics and physics. Overall, I like this paper for its methodological approach and its potential applications in modeling complex physical systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " <i>New Explicit Exact Solutions for the (1+1) Dimensional Generalized Short Water Wave Equation</i> ," is suitable but simple modification needed by including the method used by the authors.	
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.	The abstract of the article is partially comprehensive, covering the objectives, methods, and main findings. Suggested Additions 1. Add some of Applications of the study to the real-world problems.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but the sections are too short. The author(s) discussed each section clearly. Write discussion and conclusion in separate sections.	
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.	The paper is scientifically correct. The three methods (Kudryashov-expansion, modified rational sine-cosine, and Hirota bilinear) are selected for the study. However, adding a brief comparison (graphs and tables) of these methods or explaining why each method is particularly important to the proposed equation could further improve reader understanding.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and appropriately selected. Additional references are needed to make good introduction.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is medium. Need revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments to the author(s).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction section must be improved by discussing most recent related literature. 2. Cite the first and second paragraphs of the introduction section. 3. Define some technical words like kink, soliton, peakon, cusp, periodic, lump, rogue, breather etc. Or give citation. 4. Check the grammar, spelling, word usage, spacing and sentence structure. 5. Write Eqs. (2.6) and (2.10) in proper way. For example, $Bc \approx 3 (B \approx B \approx 12) \approx 0$. 6. In some graphs, the graph labels are not readable. 7. Write the physical interpretations of the graphs clearly. 8. What is the importance of using three different techniques? Please compare your results in each method. Which method is best in solving the equation? 9. Write the reasons for the authors choosing the three methods? 10. Revised the abstract by including objectives of the study, methods, novelty, results, conclusion and next investigation. 11. Figure captions must be attracted and briefly describe the graph. 12. No sentence(s) for novelty of the paper. 13. Add future research directions, limitation of the paper, contribution and motivation of the paper. 14. Improve the conclusion section by including limitations or potential improvements, future <p>directions.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Muluaem Aychluh Gizaw</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Samara University, Ethiopia</p>