

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_102455
Title of the Manuscript:	KK Theory and K Theory for Type II Strings Formalism
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>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>1. I think that every manuscript intended for scientific dissemination should have its publication encouraged. I consider the topic interesting for publication and discussions.</p> <p>2. Yes. It is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes. It is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The division is harmonious and the paper as a whole is very well structured. .</p> <p>5. Commenting references is sometimes a little difficult, as you don't always have access to all of them. I consider 50 references an excessive amount for an article of this size. Despite taking into account that the author, more than anyone else, knows the importance of each of the works consulted, I believe that this could be reviewed, if not in this one, at least in future works. As for the dates, this fact is not important in a work of pure mathematics.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<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>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>As mentioned earlier, the number of works used as references seemed exaggerated to me. I suggest observing this fact, if not in this work, at least in future works. It is impossible for a reader interested in the details of the article to consult so many references.</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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

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