



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_47029
Title of the Manuscript:	Global existence and blow-up of classical for an attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system of parabolic-elliptic-elliptic type with logistic source
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>In the report, authors deliberated upon quasilinear attraction-repulsion chemotaxis system of parabolic-elliptic-elliptic type with logistic source. Generally speaking, the aim of the study is novel. In addition, the aim and objectives of the article is within the scope of Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science. However, the present form of the paper needs minor revision. Authors should revise the manuscript using the following points:</p> <p>1. Comments on the abstract, title and references 1a. Is the aim clear? Not really. Revise.</p> <p>1b. Is it clear what the study found and how they did it? Not really. Revise.</p> <p>1c. Is the title informative and relevant? Not really. Revise.</p> <p>2. Comments on the Introduction/background 2a. Is it clear what is already known about this topic? Not really. Update the introduction with such facts.</p> <p>2b. Is the research question clearly outlined? Not really. Update the introduction with such facts. Comment: Provide a background of the problem or issue that your research aims to understand or resolve, citing studies to support your arguments.</p> <p>3. Relate your findings to those of previous studies, for example, whether your results support or deviate from results in previous studies</p> <p>4. On Pg 3, it was written "Now we state the main results." Comment: Delete. Not necessary.</p> <p>5. On Pg 15, it was written "From (4.15), we obtain that" Comment: It is absurd to use "we" in a scientific report. Author may use "From (4.15), it is obtained that"</p> <p>6. It is worth noticing that the significance of this study is to explore the interactions among nonlinear diffusion, attraction, repulsion and the logistic source on the global and blow up solvability of system. Comment: Author should incorporate this into the abstract. This is necessary because an abstract must reflect a) the significance of the aim, b) the aim, c) methodology, d) major conclusions</p>	I have revised the reviewer's comment. Please see red color parts.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	No