

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_78869
Title of the Manuscript:	The Simulation of Linear Block Algorithm for Modeling Third Order Highly Stiff Problem
Type of the Article	Research paper

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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title of the paper is ok, and the author(s) should please rewrite the abstract in-line with the title. • Introduction: only the background of the study, please recast the introduction. • The red colour means remove, while the blue means add from the correction. * The background information provided is relevant and appropriate literatures were cited. But literature is too scanty, please add more. * However, there was no sufficient information on the specific objective of this paper. * At the end of the introduction, authors should provide a clear objective of this study. * Methodology: there is no enough or clear method the authors used in comparison on this paper, but was stated in abstract, * The model equation is not stated clear. * There is no result and discussion in work * The authors should provide in details the numerical solution of the model formulated. Please recast the entire work. * References: ok and please follow the journal style. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>a. The abstract should contain clear and summary of introduction/background and objective, methodology, results and discussion, conclusions and recommendations and contribution to knowledge in a single paragraph of not more than 250 words.</p> <p>b. Please number subsection according to journal style and follow journal guide, if possible journal template to avoid rejection.</p> <p>c. The results are seems to be not from the paper, the authors should check.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>a. title is ok, abstract should be rewrite, introduction should be recast , methodology (there is no objective and aim of the work), result and discussion is not stated, the authors should recast conclusion. The authors mentioned other method, seems to be not applied in the work.</p> <p>b. The numerical methods that the authors compared their result are not explain.</p> <p>c. which method the authors compared the result of block method with, please explain.</p> <p>d. Please explain or show the gap between the work of this paper and others</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Adamu Gambo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Nigerian Army University Biu, Nigeria</i>