



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_64005
Title of the Manuscript:	Accurate time calculations of falling bodies in the Earth's gravitational field and comparisons with Newton's laws of vertical motion
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. It is suggested that the "Abstract" should be organized more logically, including the background, objective, method, result and conclusion and it must be at least 200 words and not exceeding 400 words and it must not include any questions.</p> <p>2. To fully support your study and keep it reliable and time-efficient, I suggest that you should cite more relevant references of the recent three years.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: is concise and reflecting the work done, but it needs to begin with a descriptive word such a study of the, or evaluation of, determination of, etc</p> <p>Suggested: Determinations of the accurate time calculations of falling bodies in the Earth's gravitational field compared with Newton's laws of vertical motion</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In my opinion, the paper is good on the whole. It is clearly written and well organized. The study purpose, method, result and conclusion are all clearly illustrated. The abstract needs to be rewritten. The equations are well derived and make the study more convictive. The conclusions are supported by the contents. However, there are still some parts which need to be modified in the paper. The author is suggested to make some revisions so that the paper will be better.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahmoud Hamid Mahmoud Hilo
Department, University & Country	Sudan University of Science and Technology, Sudan