

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_125769
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Stability Analysis of Commensurate Fractional-Order Systems in the Caputo Sense
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 feedback here)</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 article "On the Stability Analysis of Commensurate Fractional-Order Systems in the Caputo Sense" is a good review on the stability of Caputo's Fractional-Order Systems especially when applied to the Lorenz nonlinear system. The proofs of theorems 2.1-2.5 and 3.1-3.5 presented do not appear in the article, i.e. there inferred for the reader to look at the references, this might be burdensome for the reader. An alternative would be to write a couple of sentences summarizing the main idea of the proof as referenced in the Reference section.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the article title is suitable.	
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 is comprehensive and suitable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections are suitable.	
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.	I believe the article "On the Stability Analysis of Commensurate Fractional-Order Systems in the Caputo Sense" is technically sound and clear enough to be published. Although I would highly recommend the proofs of theorems 2.1-2.5 and 3.1-3.5 presented do not appear in the article, i.e. there inferred for the reader to look at the references, this might be burdensome for the reader. An alternative would be to write a couple of sentences summarizing the main idea of the proof as referenced in the Reference section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the subsections are suitable.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the article is written for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	N/A	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Javier Rivera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USA</b>