

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Contemporary Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2443
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring exact differential equations with GeoGebra and ChatGpt software
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript explores the application of artificial intelligence tools, such as ChatGPT and GeoGebra, in solving exact differential equations. While this method may appear straightforward, it is essential to emphasize that AI-driven solutions are prone to errors. Consequently, the accuracy and reliability of the solutions may be compromised, leading to potential inconsistencies. Incorporating AI tools like ChatGPT and GeoGebra for solving differential equations, particularly those with boundary value conditions, is not always optimal and may result in inaccurate or misleading outcomes due to inherent limitations in AI processing of mathematical problems.	
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 lacks comprehensiveness. The author should consider rephrasing the objective to reflect that while AI tools like GeoGebra and ChatGPT can provide primary solutions, they should not be considered definitive due to their susceptibility to errors. Additionally, it would be valuable to incorporate findings from academic institutions regarding the limitations and tolerance of AI in innovative research. The critical point is that these tools are not inherently solution methods; instead, they are trained to generate outputs that may not consistently align with the specific problem formulation.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript lack sufficient detail and fail to convey the objectives of the work. Instead, they appear as a collection of examples presented elsewhere without a cohesive narrative connecting them to the study's goals.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The solution of the exact differential equation output by the ChatGPT is correct. However, I expect this to be analytically solved by authors and compared to the AI output. yet the work lacks the requisite solution information that would have made the work more robust and fascinating	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The solution to the exact differential equation generated by ChatGPT is correct. However, I expect the authors to provide their analytical solution and compare it to the AI-generated output. The absence of this crucial information weakens the manuscript, as including such a comparison would have made the work more robust and engaging.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs substantial revisions to enhance its robustness. It would be beneficial for the authors to provide additional examples and, rather than relying solely on AI-generated solutions, focus on numerical solutions of exact differential equations using modern solvers like MATLAB and Python. This approach would add depth and rigor to the study.	

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:	Babatope Olabanji Pele
Department, University & Country	University of Southern California, United States of America