

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_130796
Title of the Manuscript:	Oscillation behavior for a coupled nonlinear oscillators with delays
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Studying the behaviour of coupled nonlinear systems with delay can inform the design and optimization of complex oscillators. Understanding the behaviour of coupled systems with delay is crucial in synchronization and control of complex systems Delayed coupled oscillators can model the behaviour of biological systems	thanks
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Dynamical Analysis of delayed coupled autonomous and non-autonomous oscillators OR Nonlinear dynamics of coupled systems with time delay	Change to Dynamical analysis of delayed coupled autonomous and non-autonomous oscillators

Review Form 3

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.	No. The authors failed to mention the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The methodology adopted- Research outcome- Conclusion and implications	In the abstract, We point out that the existing result in the literature has been extended from mathematical point of view. In the conclusion, we have given two theorems guaranteeing the oscillation of the solutions by a method of mathematical analysis. So the methodology is clear. For research outcome : In introduction we give the reason why we deal with the present model. In preliminaries we provide two Lemmas. The main result we have two theorems to guarantee the oscillation of the system. The simulation result verifies the effectiveness of the criteria. I consider the research outcome is clear. The conclusion has been rewritten.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	Ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Grammatical errors are many. Writing norm should be carefully revised and improved.- The advancement of nonlinear dynamics has reached a stage where the investigation of coupled models without a physical foundation necessitates the incorporation of novel nonlinear features. Regrettably, this manuscript fails to provide a clear explanation of such characteristics.- The main contributions of the paper are not concise enough in the introduction.- Equations (1 - 5) are not needed in this article because they are expected to be in the referenced papers. The authors need to give further explanation on the simulation results	Grammatical errors are corrected. I am just from mathematical point of view to discuss the dynamic behaviour, and cannot provide a clear explanation physical characteristics. If not equations 1-5, one can ask why you need to study the present model? (Because our model combines several models) The simulation indicates the oscillation of the solutions, sometimes is not smooth.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Thank you so much for the comments!