Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_49220**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Short Review and the Prediction of Tumor Growth based on Numerical Analysis**
Type of the Article	**A short review**

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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the abstract, the methodology used in the review is not clearly stated. Author(s) should elaborate on the methodology for clarity. 2. In section 3 under subsection 3.1: Author(s) seem to be combining both numeric and author-year citations. This is not allowed. There should be consistency in the citations. I suggest that they stick to the numeric citations which conforms to their referencing. 3. In section 5 after equation number (5.4), author(s) repeated the use of both numeric and author-year citations. This should as well be addressed. 4. In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 2 should read as "We analysed…, instead of "We analysis…. 5. In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 3 should be rephrased for clarity. The statement seems to be ambiguous. 6. In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 7 should be rephrased. It is not clearly stated.	1. Review methodology is now stated in the abstract. 2. Only numeric references are used and author-year is omitted. Please check the revised version. 3. Done according to the reviewer suggestions. 4. Corrected to analysed. 5. The statement is breakdown and rephrased to two statements. Please check the revised version. 6. Simply rephrased the statement and author thinks it is clear since for tumor/cancer cell growth, the initial stage is important before spreading.
Optional/General comments	1. The title and content of the review is in line with the scope of the journal and hence very relevant. 2. Author(s) have done a good work in the analysis of the problem. The qualitative analysis of the review looks good. 3. The quantitative analysis of the review article looks good. Author(s) have a good understanding of modelling. 4. All relevant information has been duly cited in the review paper. **REVIEWER'S DECISION** I suggest that the paper should be accepted for publication subject to the above-mentioned minor corrections.	The authors would like to thanks the anonymous reviewer for his/her nice comments and suggestions. Please check the acknowledgment section of the paper.

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	