

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_75196
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiparametric rational solutions of order N to the KPI equation
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although the topic of the paper is interesting, the text is neither well-written nor motivating.</li> <li>- The goal is not precisely defined. I am not really sure about the benefits of suggested algorithm in Section 2, while I believe the numerical tests and experiments in Section 3 are not enough.</li> <li>- The Introduction of the paper need more details both about the existing researches on the topic and the target.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The appendix is extremely confusing.</li> <li>- There are also some typos including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract is not justified</li> <li>• In the title of reference [19], the word equation is repeated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Although KPI equation and rational solutions are interesting and up to date topics, because of the statements above I am in doubt about the publication of this manuscript. Maybe, the best way for the authors would be to rewrite the text, cite many others references, state the novelty of the manuscript in details and provide more comparisons...</p>	

## Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### **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><i>Amin Najafi Amin</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Sharif University of Technology, Iran</i></b>