

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_99062
Title of the Manuscript:	Number of Digits in Fractional Part of Arithmetic Operations of Two Terminating Decimals
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>Compulsory REVISION</b> 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>1. I think that every manuscript intended for scientific dissemination should have its publication encouraged. <b>I consider the topic interesting for publication and discussions.</b></p> <p>2. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>4. The division is harmonious and the paper as a whole is very well structured. I especially like the inclusion of a concluding chapter and perspectives for future work.</p> <p>5. Naturally, it is not possible to verify all the mathematical developments in a short period of time, so I express my opinion more about the structure of the text. The general structure suggests correct work.</p> <p>6. Commenting references is sometimes a little difficult, as you don't always have access to all of them. I consider 16 references as an adequate amount for an article of this size. With regard to publication dates, this is not important in a work of mathematics.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	English is not my native language, so I have some difficulties with deeper issues associated with your grammar. But I believe that the text is on the same level of understanding as other academic works with which I am usually in contact.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Simal Moreira
Department, University & Country	UniFOA-Centro Universitário de Volta Redonda, Brazil