

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAM_1650</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A SYMBOLIC SOLUTION APPROACH FOR CHAOTIC INDUCED PROBLEMS</b>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	1. The results are interesting and meaningful. 2. The linearized system is asymptotically stable, which is not demonstrated in the simulation part. 3. For this manuscript with this length, the number of the references are appropriate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I have no suggestion	
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.	Instead of “An illustration is provided.”, please write, Some illustrations show the benefits of our work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. But there is an issue that subsection 4.1 is not exist.	
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 scientific correctness of this manuscript is remarkable. The authors cited lots of relevant papers in the introduction section. Unfortunately, the authors have not considered some comparison of their work with the relevant literatures. They should at least show the benefits of their work in the section 2. The numerical example is not enough. They should discuss about the results of their scheme in this section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Seems sufficient.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Milad Mohadeszadeh
Department, University & Country	Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran