

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98066
Title of the Manuscript:	HR-Stability of Generalized Quadratic functional equation in Random Norm spaces
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b> 1. <u>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</u> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <u>Is the title of the article suitable?</u> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <u>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</u> 4. <u>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</u> 5. <u>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</u> 6. <u>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</u> (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<u>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community and offers interesting ideas for research.</u> <u>The title of the article is apt and very effective</u> <u>The abstract of the article is exhaustive and ensures that the reader immediately understands the investigation.</u> <u>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and complete at all points.</u> <u>The manuscript is scientifically correct</u> <u>The references are sufficient and recent but I would still improve them to ensure that scholars can better study the paper examined.</u>	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> 1. <u>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</u>	<u>The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for academic communication, it is fluent and correct</u>	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	<u>The work is clear, very interesting. The reading is very smooth and this guarantees a good understanding.</u>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carmine Boniello
Department, University & Country	University of Salerno, Italy