

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98646
Title of the Manuscript:	FIXED POINT THEOREMS IN COMPLETE CONE RANDOM METRIC SPACES OVER BANACH ALGEBRA
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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes this is an interesting article, providing interesting generalization. The starting point is obviously</b> Fixed Point Theorems in Complete Cone Metric Spaces over Banach Algebras by Seong-Hoon Cho, but there is additional contribution which makes this text different and worth publishing.</p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but can be extended, it is only two short sentences now.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes with few minor correctons ("There is <math>x \in A</math> is called ..."page 2, "is converges"... ) which can be corrected easily.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Author should go thought the article carefully one more time and make corrections. Extend the abstract a little bit, check errors in text. I suggest use of the spellchecher. Add short Conclusion.</p>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nikola Mirkov</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>“Vinca” Institute of Nuclear Sciences, National Institute of the Republic of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Serbia</b>