



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the abstract, the methodology used in the review is not clearly stated. Author(s) should elaborate on the methodology for clarity. 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. 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. In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 2 should read as "We analysed...", instead of "We analysis..." In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 3 should be rephrased for clarity. The statement seems to be ambiguous. In section 6 (Conclusion): The statement in line 7 should be rephrased. It is not clearly stated. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The title and content of the review is in line with the scope of the journal and hence very relevant. Author(s) have done a good work in the analysis of the problem. The qualitative analysis of the review looks good. The quantitative analysis of the review article looks good. Author(s) have a good understanding of modelling. All relevant information has been duly cited in the review paper. <p>REVIEWER'S DECISION I suggest that the paper should be accepted for publication subject to the above-mentioned minor corrections.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Shaibu Osman</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya</i>