

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_95831
Title of the Manuscript:	Locally Attractivity solution of coupled fractional integral equation in Banach Algebras
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it seems interesting</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. The English leaves a lot to be desired, e.g. l7 of Introduction: 'are usually arises'	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The mathematics seems correct, but at the moment, the quality of the English is unacceptable.</p> <p>Abstract l3 'theory used theorem in' is garbled</p> <p>p1 l-2: should a new sentence start with 'many authors'?</p> <p>p1 l-1: 'The most above the literature' is garbled</p> <p>p3 (iii): 'but not converse need not true' is garbled</p> <p>p4 Defn 2.5: should alpha appear in the inequality?</p> <p>p5 Defn 2.9: 'eith' should be 'with', 'superemum' should be 'supremum', and 'followes' should be 'follows'</p> <p>p6 Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 appear to be the same.</p> <p>p9 l-5: 'superemum' should be 'supremum.' This typo is also in several other places in the paper</p> <p>p10 l1: 'Let by dominated convergence theorem' is garbled</p> <p>p14 l1: 'attarctivity' should be 'attractivity'</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roland Mallier
Department, University & Country	University of Western Ontario, Canada