

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_118370
Title of the Manuscript:	Quasi rational solutions to the fifth 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.journalajr2p.com/index.php/AJR2P/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic of the manuscript is interesting to the nonlinear science community, and the manuscript is almost clearly written.</p> <p>2. The title of the article can be “Computational analysis and quasi rational solutions to the fifth equation of the NLS hierarchy”</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is too short. The abstract section must be extended a little more with an explanation of solution technique and findings.</p> <p>4. The subsection 2 to 4 should be enclosed in section and other structure of the manuscript almost appropriate.</p> <p>5. The article is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The authors should be adding some new approaches which will increase the reader's interest and potentiality of the article. authors can follow the article: 10.1088/1751-8113/44/43/435204,</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. English is generally good; I think it needs to be polished further and some typos need to be revised. Further punctuation marks should be checked throughout the paper, especially after the equations and at the end of the statements.</p> <p>2. The introduction seems weak in terms of the literature review. The inclusion of some new approaches will increase the reader's interest.</p> <p>3. The authors should be modify the equation (2) “= =”</p> <p>4. The authors should be add the research gap in the introduction section.</p> <p>5. The figures should be cited in the text and in front view.</p> <p>6. Reformulate the keywords and the conclusion to reflect the contents of the paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The contents of the paper are good. Anyhow, I would like to see the above modifications, whether minor or major, in the revised version, which would increase the strength of the paper and increase its potential readers, as well as improve the current work. I recommend the publication of this paper after the corrections given above.</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:	Md. Al-Amin
Department, University & Country	Islamic University, Bangladesh