

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_95507
Title of the Manuscript:	Common fixed point theorems for four self-maps satisfying generalized (ψ, ϕ)- weak contraction in metric space
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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. This paper gives the scope for future research in the topic Yes. Title is appropriate. Abstract is explaining the concept clearly. But make it much more constructive. No. The paper is not well constructive. Introduction is nothing but it explains the previous findings in the topic and other related concepts. Author does not include these concepts in that. Introduction must be rewritten. All theorems do not need explained proofs Kindly trim that as well. Conclusion part is very important for the manuscript. It should be included. Add more number of references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Good.	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Vidhya
Department, University & Country	Cauvery College for Women, India