



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_25673
Title of the Manuscript:	Note on "Mean square solution of second-order random differential equations by using homotopy analysis method"
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

	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	The author(s) aimed to point out some observations and corrections on a previously published work of [1] even when using the same solution method: homotopy analysis method (HAM). Interpreting the results (graphically), there is a coincidence and agreement between the present work and those of [3,4,5]. It is a good and welcoming idea. However, my observations and suggestions are as follows: (*)There SHOULD be a section (say section 2) for the overview/analysis of the used method (for instant, see [5], section 2. Variational Iteration Method). (**) Thereafter, the author(s) should SHOW how the method is applied to get the results (in their examples section) OTHERWISE, one may see it as a mere and an arbitrarily LIFTING of results (at least solve one example in detail via the HAM and refer to the approach for other examples)	We have added two sections which are; In page 2, section Homotopy analysis method And In page 10, section Conclusion



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(***) The graphs are UNLABELLED. They should be labelled appropriately (see those of [5,4,3]) All graphs are labelled	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammatical issues: <i>Abstract:</i> {line 3} * ... to solve the same problem and we draw some... instead of to solve the same problem and we draw a... ** page 101 under test examples, line 2 The results are coincide with results s in [3; 4; 5] {remove the: are and add s}: *** in all the examples, use: Consider the random initial value problem {add the } NOT Consider random initial value problem **** The work needs to be read for grammatical issues.	We have corrected all grammatical errors in text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		