

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_103253
Title of the Manuscript:	Construction and Convergence of the C-S Combined Mean Method for Multiple Polynomial Zeros
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This is a good study. The researcher(s) must introduce the reader by explaining what zero is and whether it is a positive or negative integer and why it must be used in this analysis. What is the significance of zero in polynomial Mathematics?</p> <p>The title is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is incomplete with some missing key word(s).</p> <p>Introduce the statement of the problem and proceed to carry out the analysis. Methodology and analytical tools are succinct.</p> <p>A good scientific analysis has been carried out.</p> <p>References are diverse in scope and scale.</p> <p>The researcher(s) need to explain to the scientific community who the stakeholders of this analysis are and why it is necessary.</p> <p>Recommendations for further research on the subject matter haven't been provided.</p> <p>Rethink "<u>type of the article</u>"</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	A good scholarly article.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	N/A	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elijah W Chindia
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya