Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Mathematics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOM_84786**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exact analytical solution of Ivancevic options pricing model or Schrödinger's equation via ADM and SBA methods**
Type of the Article	**Review 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:

(https://www.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-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	After a careful reading of the Manuscript number Ms_ARJOM_84786, my comment and my remarks are as follows 1. The first observation that emerges after reading this manuscript is that the fundamentals required for writing a scientific article are not respected. 2. You have to write the abstract well while trying to situate the readers in relation to your main results obtained; you should also clearly summarize your work. 3. the introduction is too vague, you are solving the schrödinger equation which models wave dynamics in physical systems. but in your introduction, you do nothing to situate this equation a bit in its context by indicating what it is for even as you remain in a purely mathematical angle, you will have to bear in mind that the field of application of your equation remains physics. You will therefore have to do a good literature review while trying to cite some works and recent methods that exist in the jargon of nonlinear physics and mathematics. 4. In your introduction, you should highlight the motivation that pushed you to do this work, how the work is a plus compared to other work. 5. always in the introduction, you must give the plan of your work by saying how the work is organized. 6. We notice that equation (1) is the same as equation (5), equation (2) is the same as equation (6), equation (3) is the same as equation (7) . My question is, are all these repetitions necessary? 7. The numbering of the equations in the manuscript is badly done and must be fixed while assigning numbers to all the equations which are not incorporated in the sentences. 8. below theorem 2, you write allorithm # algorithm, what is it about? 9. Other than where you present the algorithms, your equations throughout the text should be numbered. 10.You need a substantial conclusion that goes over your results obtained, accompanied by clear comments on the objective of the work and on the importance of using the methods used. 11. You must enrich your references with some works that deal with Schrödinger's equations, whether in quantum physics or in nonlinear physics and mathematics 12. Overall, there is nothing new in this work, although the authors can nevertheless organize its writing well so that it is digestible and worthy of a scientific publication.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	My general feeling is that this work is deeply edited in order to make it acceptable for publication	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Bogning Jean Roger**
Department, University & Country	**University of Bamenda, Cameroon**