Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_75196**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Multiparametric rational solutions of order N to the KPI equation**
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	- Although the topic of the paper is interesting, the text is neither well-written nor motivating. - The goal is not precisely defined. I am not really sure about the benefits of suggested algorithm in Section 2, while I believe the numerical tests and experiments in Section 3 are not enough. - The Introduction of the paper need more details both about the existing researches on the topic and the target.	This paper is part of a program of research of rational solutions of partial differential equations. New solutions of the KPI equation are presented here. It has been added in the introduction the following text : From the 1980's, a lot of methods have been found to solve that equation. We can quote the nonlocal Riemann-Hilbert problem, the d-bar problem or inverse scattering problem using integration in the complex plane. More details can be found in the book by Ablowitz and Clarkson published in 1991\cite{Ablowitz2}. We can cite in particular the works of Krichever \cite{Krichever2}, Satsuma and Ablowitz in 1979 \cite{Satsuma}, Matveev in 1979 \cite{Matveev3}, Freeman and Nimmo in 1983 \cite{Freeman1, Freeman2}, Pelinovsky and Stepanyants in 1993 \cite{Pelinovsky3}, Pelinovsky in 1994 \cite{Pelinovsky2}, Ablowitz and Villarroel \cite{Ablowitz3, Villarroel} in 1997-1999, Biondini and Kodama \cite{Biondini, Kodama, Biondini2} in 2003-2007.
Minor REVISION comments	- The appendix is extremely confusing. - There are also some typos including: • The abstract is not justified • In the title of reference [19], the word equation is repeated.	The appendix has been changed in a more compact formulation. The abstract has been rewritten. It has been corrected.
Optional/General comments	Although KPI equation and rational solutions are interesting and up to date topics, because of the statements above I am in doubt about the publication of this manuscript. Maybe, the best way for the authors would be to rewrite the text, cite many others references, state the novelty of the manuscript in details and provide more comparisons…	We present in the paper new rational solutions. The studt could be extended to the following orders and try to analyse the patterns of the solutions in terms of roots of particular polynomials.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

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)*	