Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Current Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOCS_1805**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Stability Analysis Of Explicit Finite Difference Methods For Neutral Stochastic Differential Equations With Multiplicative Noise**
Type of the Article	**Regular paper**

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript is well written. The authors needs to address the following comments.** 1. What is the purpose of Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) Condition and Von Neumann Stability Analysis 2. Point out the significance of your findings after literature review. 3. Discuss elaborately about the Figures 1-6. 4. How do the authors handle the stochastic term.An explanation is needed? 5. Provide some real time model in numerical example.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract appears to be huge. Summarise it appropriately.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes. It is Correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. Add more most recent references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**P. Balasubramaniam**
Department, University & Country	**The Gandhigram Rural Institute, India**