

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_94068
Title of the Manuscript:	Another Look of Rings Domination in Ladder Graph
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theorem 3.1 and the proof are should be improved. For example, T_a is a restrained dominating set of P_n may be changed as $T_u=T_v$ is a restrained dominating set of P_n. Also, at the end of the proof, the authors must prove the sufficient part. In other words, if conditions 1 and 2 hold then they must check if D is a rings dominating set. In Example 3.2, what are (i), (ii), and (iii)? In the proof Theorem 3.3, explain why $S \geq 2 \lfloor \frac{n+6}{3} \rfloor$. I suggest that the authors should state a lemma which is proved in the article (, G.S Domke et.al., Restrained domination in graphs, Proposition 6.) in the section Preliminary Notes and cite the lemma and Theorem 3.1. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 2, line 11: $D \subset V(G)$ instead of $D \in V(G)$ Page 3, line 18: $D = \cup_{u \in S} (\{u\} \times T_u) = \{(u, w_{i_1}), (u, w_{i_2}), \dots, (u, w_{i_s})\}$ instead of $D = \cup_{u \in S} (\{u\} \times T_u) = \{(u, w_{\{1\}}, (u, w_{\{2\}}, \dots, (u, w_{\{n\}})\}$. Page 3, lines 22, 25, 28: $V(P_n) - T_a$ instead of $T_a - V(P_n)$. Page 5, line 2: My suggestion is that choose $P = \{1, 4, 5, 6, 9, \dots, n-3, n\}$. Because, when $n=6$ the construction doesn't work. Similarly, change TS in Case 3. Page 5, line 10: K instead of R. Page 5, line 17: $T = V(P_2 \times P)$ instead of $R = V(P_2 \times P)$. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the end of the proof of Theorem 3.4, a construction of a maximal rings domination set with cardinality $2n-4$. 	

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:	Lkhagva Buyantogtokh
Department, University & Country	Mongolian National University of Education, Mongolia