

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAM_1650
Title of the Manuscript:	A SYMBOLIC SOLUTION APPROACH FOR CHAOTIC INDUCED PROBLEMS
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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant topic within the field of nonlinear dynamics and chaos theory, proposing a symbolic solution approach to chaotic systems. The proposed method, which involves transforming a nonlinear system into a linear periodic one, could be a valuable contribution to the scientific community, particularly for those working on stability analysis and control of chaotic systems. I appreciate the innovative approach taken by the authors, although the manuscript could benefit from clearer explanations and more practical examples to better illustrate the applicability of the proposed method.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "A Symbolic Solution Approach for Chaotic Induced Problems" is generally suitable as it reflects the core focus of the manuscript. However, it could be made more descriptive by including terms like "Linearization" and "Feedback Control," which are crucial to the paper's content. A possible alternative title could be: "Linearization of Chaotic Systems through a Symbolic Solution and Feedback Control Approach."	
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.	The abstract is fairly comprehensive but could benefit from more clarity. It effectively summarizes the core methodology and results but lacks specific details on the implications of the findings and how they advance the field. I suggest adding a brief statement on the practical applications of the proposed approach and its significance in solving real-world chaotic problems.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate for a scientific paper. The logical flow from the introduction to the proposed method, followed by numerical examples and conclusions, is well-organized. However, the introduction could be enhanced with a more in-depth literature review to better position the manuscript within the existing body of work.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, offering a methodologically solid approach to addressing chaotic systems. The use of symbolic computation, feedback control, and the application of the Floquet theory are well-established techniques in the field, and their integration into a single approach is innovative. The theoretical derivations are thorough, and the numerical examples provided support the validity of the proposed method. However, more extensive testing across different types of chaotic systems could further strengthen the manuscript's claims.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are generally sufficient and include both foundational works and recent studies, ensuring that the manuscript is grounded in established research while also being up-to-date. However, some references are slightly outdated, such as those from the 1980s and 1990s. Including more recent studies from the last five years could provide a more current perspective on the topic.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the manuscript is acceptable for scholarly communication, though it could benefit from minor revisions for clarity and conciseness. Some sentences are complex and could be simplified for better readability. Additionally, there are a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed to enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. A thorough proofreading or review by a native English speaker could be beneficial.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farhang Salehi
Department, University & Country	Iran