

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_103159
Title of the Manuscript:	Some Fixed Point Theorems in e- Complete E-Metric Space
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>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. The authors have showed fixed point results for various contractions in E- metric space. They have also investigated implicit relation to find fixed point result in E- metric space. Some corollaries, examples and theorem have been established. The article is interesting one.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article should be more comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are ok.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article needs minor modification to the following points:</p> <p>1. The punctuations throughout the article should be checked. As for example in the second line from the bottom of "Introduction and Preliminaries" section "let E be an normed space with a norm" should be written as "Let E be an normed space with a norm"</p> <p>2. In the last line of Definition 1.2. "In this above definition," should be written as "In the above definition",</p> <p>3. In the first line of Definition 1.4. "be an E-metric space, then a" should be written as "be an E-metric space. Then a"</p> <p>4. In the second line of Example 1.1. "having as unit ball, the polygon" should be written as "having as unit ball. The polygon" Also in the same example "then it is easy to show that" should be written as "Then it is easy to show that"</p> <p>5. In the second line of Theorem 1.3. ". Then T has a unique fixed point in X, and" should be written as ". Then T has a unique fixed point in X and"</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article may be accepted with the above modifications.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Runu Dhar
Department, University & Country	Maharaja Bir Bikram University, India