



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_55543
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF SOME FLOW PARAMETERS ON UNSTEADY MHD FLUID FLOW PAST A MOVING VERTICAL PLATE EMBEDDED IN POROUS MEDIUM IN THE PRESENCE OF HALL CURRENT AND ROTATING SYSTEM
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>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Author(s) are not consistent in citations. They used both numeric and author-year citations. This is not acceptable. I suggest that they consider only the numeric citations to conform to their style of REFERENCES. This <b>Chamkha et.al.[3]</b>, should be stated as "Authors in [3] instead. This <b>Ibrahim et al. [6]</b>, should be stated as "Authors in [6].</li> <li>2. Under the section MATHEMATICAL MODEL AND ANALYSIS: The equations are not really visible. Author(s) should arrange their equations for clarity purposes.</li> <li>3. Under the section RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS: Author(s) have combined all the discussion under one main sections. This is quite unacceptable. Every graph of figure should have its discussions separately and reference should be made to the said graph or figure as in text.</li> <li>4. Under the section CONCLUSION: Author(s) should write their conclusion without numbering. Moreover, the conclusion should be in line with the objective of the article.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article is in line with the scope of the journal.</li> <li>2. The model and its qualitative analysis is quite good. Author(s) have demonstrated an understanding of the subject area.</li> <li>3. The numerical or quantitative analysis part of the article looks good.</li> <li>4. The general organisation of the article is quite impressive.</li> </ol> <p>DECISION:</p> <p>Subject to the suggested minor corrections, I recommend the publication of this article. Accept if the above minor corrections have been incorporated.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shaibu Osman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Basic and Biomedical Sciences, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ghana</b>