



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_60607
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Thermal Radiation and Heat Source on MHD Blood Flow with an Inclined Magnetic Field in Treating Tumor and Low Blood Pressure.
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>In the present work, a theoretical analysis on the effect of radiation and heat source on unsteady MHD blood flow through an artery with an inclined magnetic field is discussed. The manuscript may be beneficial for further research in therapeutic procedures. The presented work is interesting, however, following modifications are recommended to improve it further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The novelty of the present work should be discussed in the introduction section with reference to the recently published similar work. Few recent studies in year 2019 and 2020 should have been cited. 2. A proper justification should be given for the selection of 'Roseland's approximation'. The appropriate comments on optical thickness, scattering and absorption characteristics should be mentioned. 3. The velocity-slip as well as the thermal slip should have been taken into account; else a proper justification should be given. 4. The Computational procedure to solve the differential equations should have been explained in detail. 5. Proper explanation on the results presented in fig. 2.1 to 2.13 is expected. The author has given the comments which can be easily interpreted from the figures; the proper justifications on the causes are expected. 6. It is highly recommended to compare the obtained results with the existing literature. 7. The future work scope should have been mentioned in the conclusion section. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Sandeep S. Joshi
Department, University & Country	Shri Ramdeobaba College of Engineering and Management, India