

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_118368
Title of the Manuscript:	Quasi-rational solutions to the seventh equation of the NLS hierarchy
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 '**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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Quasi-rational solutions to the seventh equation of the NLS hierarchy are constructed. The authors give explicit expressions of these solutions for the first orders. The author conducted beneficial explorations and achieved some results. The manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not sufficient and recent. I suggest the author increase the number of references, especially those published in the past three years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper lists many formulas and the calculation process is quite detailed. However, the content of the argument is insufficient, and it is recommended to add it appropriately.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Cai Yang
Department, University & Country	Nanyang Normal University, China