

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_130419
Title of the Manuscript:	Theoretical Analysis of Nonlinear partial differential equations with Mixed Boundary Conditions
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>

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Review Report on “Theoretical Analysis of Nonlinear partial differential equations with Mixed Boundary Conditions” The paper needs modifications before publication. The comments are as follows. 1. Include the need and motivation of the study at the start of the abstract, followed by assumptions of the present work, methodology, novel observations and some of the practical implications of the study. 2. The introduction is not written properly. Improve it. 3. Why the authors have neglected viscous dissipation while incorporating ohmic dissipation? 4. Add SI units to nomenclature. 5. Add more details to the physical sketch of the flow. 6. References should be written properly. References 1 and 2 are not properly written in References section. 7. The authors should discuss the engineering quantities of interest at the walls. 8. The slip condition needs to be corrected. It should have an expression for Casson fluid parameter. 9. Authors should update the introduction with more recent related literature. Remove the old literature. https://doi.org/10.1177/09544089241239824 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2023.102776 https://doi.org/10.1108/HFF-11-2018-0685 https://doi.org/10.25163/biosensors.119823 https://doi.org/10.1080/10407782.2024.2367091 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2024.109349 10. What are the limitations of the study? 11. On what basis the values of the parameters are selected? Is the solution valid for all values of the parameters?	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jafar Hasnain
Department, University & Country	Bahria University Islamabad Campus, Pakistan