



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_48970
Title of the Manuscript:	Pullback Absorbing set for the stochastic lattice Selkov equations
Type of the 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	<p>This paper discusses the pullback absorbing property for the stochastic reversible Selkov system in an infinite lattice with additive white noises. A transformation of addition is exploited in proving the pullback absorbing property. The related definitions of the pullback absorbing property are introduced. An Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (O-U) process is introduced on the metric dynamical system, given by the Wiener process. Then, the result of the pullback absorbing property, which is presented in a lemma form, is discussed. Overall, the content of the paper is well discussed, however, the presentation of the paper shall be further improved. Some comments are given as follow.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract, the full name of the term "O-U process" shall be given, otherwise, what is "O-U" stand for? 2. The content of the abstract is really short, just written in one sentence. Could it be extended and giving more information? 3. How does Equation (3.1) obtain? It seems that Equation (3.1) is derived from Equation (1.1), but do not see any explanation about this. 4. The equation numbering in the paper is not done properly. When an equation is referred to in the text, the term of "the equation above" or "the equation below" makes confusion. Please avoid this, and it is suggested to use the equation number to mention the related equation in the text. 5. In Page 2, see the proof of Lemma 4.1, what does "Taking the inner product (3.1)..." mean? Does Equation (3.1) an inner product? It is suggested to write "Taking the inner product to (3.1)...", this is what has been done in the proof. 6. In Page 3, on the top for the first sentence, what does "Summing the three equations up ..." mean? Only TWO equations in Equation (4.1), do not have THREE equations. Please revise. 7. Please add a citation to Young's inequality. 8. Please add a citation to Gronwall's inequality. 9. The equation numbering for Equation (4.4) is quite confuse, does this (4.4) refer to the last equation? It is suggested to revise this equation numbering since there are SIX (6) equations, and do a proper equation numbering. 	The author is agreed with reviewer. The author have corrected the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The references [3], [5], [9], [10], [11] are not cited in the text. Please check properly. 2. There are some grammatical mistakes, please do the correction carefully. 	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	