

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_120697
Title of the Manuscript:	The double inversion technique in the Somé Blaise Abbo method applied to Schrödinger-type fractional-order evolution equations
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://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 feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for scientific community. The study is relevant, and the authors are interested in solving Schrödinger problems with initial and Neumann conditions. The authors used the new double inversion technique in the Somé Blaise Abbo(SBA) method to solve some fractional order partial differential equations (edp) in the Caputo sense of the Schrödinger type by integrating all boundary conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the tite of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive. Author should revise the abstract by explaining further the aim of the study stating the results achieved in the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure are not appropriate. Author should include Discussion and Results section in the research.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as the study involves the gymnastics of double inversion resulting from that of SBA to determine the solutions of fractional-order Schrödinger equations in the sense of Caputo with initial and Neumann conditions. The results thus obtained converge with those determined by other analytical methods. This strategy is well suited to fractional-order models.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 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:	Christopher Oluwatobi Adeogun
Department, University & Country	South China University of Technology, China