

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. The manuscript can be considered for its reference to and alignment to existing literature. 2. Suggested, "An investigation into The Properties of Functions Defining Distinguished Varieties" 3. The abstract is deficient of the finding(s) of the investigation proposed on the properties of the functions. 4. The investigations should be distinct from the results (see 3.1 and 3.2) 5. Relatively correct to the extent of its synchronised nature with existing literature. 6. Ok and relatively recent (50%<10years)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some structural corrections are identified and recommended to be effected.	
Optional/General comments	No optional comments (all are compulsory)	

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:	Madu, Cletus Ifeanyi
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Education, Nigeria