

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_119579
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Open Channel Fluid Flow past a Trapezoidal Cross-section with a Segment Base having Lateral Inflow Channel
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article clearly reflects the purpose and content of the study and contributes scientifically to the literature. 2. The title of the article is appropriate. 3. The summary of the article is comprehensive but there are some deficiencies. I added these to the description section. 4. The subsections and structure of the article are not appropriate and need to be changed. 5. I think the article is scientifically correct. 6. References are not enough, references must be added. 	
<p>Major REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language of the article needs to be revised.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In this article, the modeling of a trapezoidal cross-section open channel with a side entry channel is discussed. It was stated that turbulence was neglected and the flow was assumed to be laminar. Model equations were nondimensionalized and solved using the finite difference method. Simulations were made with MATLAB software. Making the language of the article more fluent and explaining the methodology in more detail will help the reader understand the study better. More descriptive graphics and tables will make it easier to understand the findings. However, with serious shortcomings, I am adding below a list of changes that authors should make in their articles.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized the purpose, method, and findings of the study. However, some sentences can be restructured to make the summary more fluid and understandable. • The first two sentences of the summary are not needed. • There is no need for a sentence starting with The results are discussed. • More detail on how the findings are used in engineering applications would be helpful. • The "area" in the keywords should be Area. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be useful to conduct a more comprehensive literature review in the introduction section. The deficiencies in the existing literature and how this study addresses these deficiencies can be explained in more detail. • The purpose of the study should be stated more clearly. Specific research questions or hypotheses may be stated. • The last paragraph of the introduction can be mentioned in the structure of the article. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The study does not include a Method and method section. This title can be added to the article and the relevant formulas and methodology can be explained under it. Otherwise, it looks very messy.• It may be useful to present the equations and mathematical models used in the methodology more understandably. Each of the equations can be explained step by step.• Explaining in more detail how MATLAB simulations were performed and how the resulting data was analyzed may make it easier for the reader to repeat the study. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All results can be given under the heading of Findings. In the study, graphical explanations are presented as a title. These can be changed and presented under a single title.• Graphs and tables can be made more descriptive to make the results more understandable. Detailed explanations should be made for each graph and table.• How the findings are compatible with or differ from other studies in the literature can be discussed in more depth.• Fig.3. The text should be changed to Figure 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:	Ibrahim Halil Demirel
Department, University & Country	Batman University, Turkey