



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_54909
Title of the Manuscript:	Computational Analysis of the Stability of 2D Heat Equation on Elliptical Domain Using FDM
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>This paper discusses the computational analysis for the stability of the 2D heat equation on the elliptical domain using the FDM. The related stability ranges are determined in this study. The content provides some insights to the topic concerned. However, the presentation of the paper shall be further improved. Some comments are given as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The term FDM is used in the title of the paper but it does not define clearly in the text. 2. The term 2D is not clearly defined too. 3. The acronym of the partial differential equations, that is PDEs, is defined at the first time the full name appears in the text but the acronym is not used in a consistent way in the following text. If the full name is still using in the following text, then it does not need to define the acronym. 4. The numbering of the equation shall be put at the end of the line at the right-hand side consistently. 5. See Page 1, "2 dimensional and 2 dimensional" and "2D and 3D", please define the acronyms before they are used in the following text. 6. See Page 1, "Han et al. [4]", is this the correct way to write the citation in the text? Please refer to the format to write the citation. The same comment is also for "Kazufumi et. al [8]." 7. See Page 2, "dimensions. [9] Proposed", please refer to the format to write the citation in the text. 8. Do not see Eq. (2), please check. 9. Notations and symbols shall be written in the <i>italic</i> form. 10. Page 4, "the following Eq. (8) is obtained" shall be revised to be "the following Eq. (6) is obtained". 11. See Page 5, Eq. (9), (10) and (11) do not have any explanation, what are they mean? 12. See Pages 8 and 9, any differences between the graphs in Figure 6? 13. Do not have the section of problem description, the problem statement has been described in Section 2 Methodology. This is not a proper way of writing a research article, it is better to write in an organized way. 14. Do not have Section 3, please check. 15. Please refer to the format in preparing the references. 16. Please make sure all references are cited in the text. 17. There are some grammatical mistakes, please do the correction carefully. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Sie Long Kek</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University in Parit Raja, Malaysia</i>