



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_43054
Title of the Manuscript:	Modeling Exponential growth and Exponential Decay Real Phenomena of by ψ – Caputo Fractional Derivative
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>)

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	In this paper, the author(s) obtained that the ψ-Caputo fractional differential equation is better than their integer-order counterpart for modeling the radioactivity decay and the RC circuit charging. After reviewing, I give the comments as follows: 1. The Introduction section is a little simple, that is a little misstatement in the first paragraph, the author(s) should deal with the background of the proposed problems: why do we study this? How do we study this? 2. Definition 3.1 is improper. 3. Page 4, (5) is not a definition, only the corresponding equation for the equation (3). 4. Page 4, the results "... the best value that would help in minimizing the error while fitting the original data using (4)", please provide the results to other reference object. 5. It is not have to derive Ohm's law in Page 7. 6. Consider carefully the results of the SSE and RMSD methods to the problem (21). Moreover, there exist some revision places: 1. The format of references are very confusion, we do not know what is said. 2. The behind of many formulas, equations are lack of punctuation mark. 3. The form of Tables are not correct.	1 Introduction revised and improved 2 fixed 3 fixed 4 the values are given as $\lambda = 0.0121 \leftrightarrow \tau = 82.6446$ 5 The ohms law is not derived but it established the prerequisite to next equations 6 the results were checked and considered. 1 All adjusted to APA referencing style 2 Punctuations were checked 3 Table form were corrected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		