

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_96874
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Properties of Functions Defining Distinguished Varieties
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)
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)	1. This paper brings important contributions to the topic of distinguished varieties, which appears to be a burgeoning field in complex analysis. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the paper is comprehensive. 4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references comprise everything which has been written in this field. 7. This topic can be expanded in different ways, as for example finding more interesting properties of functions defining distinguished varieties, studying distinguished varieties of higher dimensions etc.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think that in the formula at the end of page 2 the coefficient 4 should be deleted. The English is good, but not perfect.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dorin Ghisa
Department, University & Country	York University, Canada