



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_46304
Title of the Manuscript:	Existence of random attractors for the stochastic reaction-diffusion equation with distribution derivatives and multiplicative noise on \mathbb{R}^n
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>)



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 existence of the random attractors for a stochastic reaction-diffusion equation, where the distribution derivatives and multiplicative noise defined on the unbounded domains are considered. The use of a priori estimates for far-field values of solutions and the cut-off technique are applied to obtain the asymptotic compactness of the random dynamical system. Overall, the results are well-discussed, however, the presentation of the paper shall be further improved.</p> <p>Some comments are given as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract shall be revised to add more information. 2. In Section 1, Page 2, see the equation "$W(t) = W(t; \omega) = \alpha(t)$", where does this equation come from? This equation seems incorrect in concept. Please give the citation(s). 3. Please use either "Equation (1.1)", "Eq. (1.1)" or "(1.1)" consistently in the text. Do not mix them to use, and also do not use "the equation (1.1)", "the Eq. (1.1)" in the text. The same comment goes to other equations that are mentioned in the text. Please revise. 4. In Section 2, do all the definitions and the theorem are come from the own idea of the author or referred from somewhere? Please give the citation if they are not come from the own idea. 5. In Section 3, the section title is too long. Is it possible giving a suitable section title? 6. Equations (3.1) and (3.2) repeat the same equations of Equations (1.1) and (1.2). Is it a must? Perhaps, Equations (1.1) and (1.2) can be mentioned in Section 3 or in the other way. 7. In Section 3, Page 5, see "Note that the two random dynamical system are equivalent." Please mention clearly which two random dynamical systems are equivalent. 8. In Section 4, Pages 10 and 11. There shall be a better way to mention Conditions (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) in the text, indeed, (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) are equations. Please mention these conditions in a proper way. 9. No conclusion is given. It is better to write a conclusion at the end of the paper and put the conclusion before References. 10. There are some grammatical mistakes, please do the correction carefully. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Section 1, Page 2, please do not use "can't" in the text, it is better using "cannot", please revise. 2. In Section 2, Page 2, see "The reader is referred to [2, 7]..." who is this reader? It is suggested to write "For more details, see [2, 7]". 3. In Section 3, Page 4, see "...which is called the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process..." please give a citation to "Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (citation)". 4. Please write notations and symbols in the <i>italic</i> form. 5. In Section 4, Page 6, see "By applying the Gronwall's lemma to (4.7)..." Please give a citation to "the Gronwall's lemma (citation)". 6. In Section 4, do all the lemmas and the related proof are proposed by the author? If they are referred from somewhere, please give the citation(s). 7. In Section 4, Page 10, see "By the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality..." Please give a citation to "the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality (citation)". 8. In Section 5, please give the citation to the lemmas and the related proof discussed if these lemmas and the related proof are not proposed from the own idea of the author. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sie Long Kek
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia