

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_120625
Title of the Manuscript:	On top local homology modules
Type of the Article	Original Research Article.

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		Ok.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		Ok.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		Ok.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		Ok.
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		Ok.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		Ok.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		Ok.
Optional/General comments	<p>Summary: In this paper, the authors investigate the associated primes of the top local homology module of a non-zero Artinian R-module A over a local ring R with a unique maximal ideal. The Noetherian dimension of the module is considered to be s, and the paper aims to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between local homology, associated primes, and the structure of Artinian modules.</p> <p>The paper makes a notable contribution to the study of associated primes in local homology but would benefit from enhancements in motivation, clarity, and applicability. I recommend publication after addressing the below comments, which will strengthen the overall impact of the work.</p> <p>Comments and Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract should include more specific details on the methodology and emphasize the research's importance, scientific innovation, and impact. This would enhance the summary of the paper and better engage readers by clearly outlining the proposed numerical approach's innovation and significance.• Lack of Motivation and Context: While the mathematics is solid, the paper would benefit from a more detailed introduction that not only states the problem but also motivates it within the broader context of local homology theory. Highlighting previous work and the significance of the results would enhance reader engagement.• The paper assumes a certain level of background knowledge. Providing a more comprehensive explanation of some key concepts related to local homology and associated primes could help make the paper more accessible.• Keywords should not include words already used in the title of the manuscript.• Check the names of all the journals from the list of references, including the abbreviated ones.• The conclusion section is missing; you can add it by reminding the reader of the mathematical apparatus used in each step and the valuable results obtained. Also, some comments and conclusions about the applicability of new results to extend the presented research analysis. <p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The source of the definition in the paper should be indicated and given clear references. For example, see Definition 2.1., Definition 2.2. <p>Sincerely,</p>	<p>I made all the changes the referee requested.</p> <p>I agree with the reviewer and have made the changes.</p>

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.</p>	I agree with the reviewer and have made the changes.