

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_122333
Title of the Manuscript:	HYDROMAGNETIC TURBULENT FLOW IN POROUS MEDIA OVER A STRETCHING SURFACE IN A ROTATING SYSTEM WITH HEAT
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 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.	This manuscript studies combined impact of magnetic fields, buoyancy force, porosity, rotation, and Joule's heating on flow variables through numerical analysis. The objectives of the authors are interesting considering the application areas and need to be discussed carefully. The results presented have potential to be published if discussed in details and clearly bringing out the conclusion from them.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	I suggest to make abstract more inclusive giving overall scenario of the study. Few sentences are not linked in the abstract. These need some introduction to the reader.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. subsections can be re-organised.	
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.	The results (Graphs and data) are scientifically robust and technically good. The explanation behind the presented results needs to be added in the manuscript. It is very difficult to understand what authors are trying to implicate with this study as no discussion talk about technical points and its relation to the objectives of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references needed.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of English need to be improved. A few grammatical updates are needed. This can not be concluded as scholarly communication as there is no discussion of the results.	
Optional/General comments	Reference 3,5, 6, 7 provide details (mention authors names) Provide additional references about hydromagnetic turbulent flow studies. Provide references for all equation or details on how you derived them Provide all (missing) notation for symbols used in the equations Author may provide table for non-dimensional analysis Kindly check equations for correctness The algorithm for solving the equations should be discussed in details. Results are interesting but need to discuss to bring out the observations. Merely discussing what is there is figure do not lead to any conclusions.	

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:	Amol Ganjare
Department, University & Country	University of Limerick, Ireland