

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_126561
Title of the Manuscript:	MHD Flow from a Vertical Porous Plate in presence of Heat Source
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 „**Jack 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>

Review Form 3

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</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 study addresses heat source effect through thermal radiation on electrically conducting fluid dynamics. The dynamics and mathematical formulation considered the relevant factors for the stated problem under study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Unsteady MHD Flow past a Semi Infinite Vertical Porous Plate in the Presence Heat Source	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript follows a structured template format and all sections are appropriately addressing the relevant forms. The following are needed to be addressed; 1. The introduction does not provide adequate information on relevant factors considered in the study and much more necessary citation of literatures are required. 2. The results discussion does not provide adequate discussion on the flow profiles from the graph shown.	
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.	1. The mathematical formulations and governing equations has the relevant factors for the problems. 2. The flow profiles and parameters are well considered 3. The method of solution sufficiently solve the problems formed	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	1. The references are not sufficiently reflecting the previous research on the relevant factors considered in the study. 2. Recent studies are not much shown in the citations and refences.	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Specific comments are stated on the manuscript which should also be look into.	

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:	Yale Ibrahim Danjuma
Department, University & Country	Kampala International University, Western Campus, Uganda