

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_103141
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMON FIXED POINT THEOREMS FOR CONTRACTIVE MAPPINGS ON C^* - ALGEBRA VALUED B-METRIC SPACES
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The article is of interest to mathematical community interested in generalizations of various fixed point theorems.</p> <p>The title is suitable and it is easy to figure out what previous work it relies on.</p> <p>The abstract is short but to the point.</p> <p>The structure is based on the Introduction, Main results (with an example) and Conclusions.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically sound, starting point + motivation is ok, the proofs seem correct. The example is a bit simple, but seems correct.</p> <p>I don't have additional requirements for new references. The work of Ma et al. used as a starting point is included in references, other than that there are citations on material relevant to C^* algebras, and operator algebras, as well as fixed point related references.</p> <p>The difficulty with the article is with a bit unusual symbols, but it is necessary these days because of the high similarity that usual notation produces.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is correct minor checks are required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest this article for publication as is.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Nikola Mirkov
Department, University & Country	University of Belgrade, Republic of Serbia