

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_97691
Title of the Manuscript:	FIXED POINT THEOREM FOR (ϕ, \mathfrak{F}) – EXPANSIVE MAPPINGS IN CONE b -METRIC SPACES OVER BANACH ALGEBRA
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	Yes	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It must be revised.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	No, the sections and subsections must be added. Comparative analysis should also be added to highlight the impact. Research paper should have some limitations of the research. Conclusion is missing.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript requires modifications in order to make it correct.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	More reference should be added.	
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)		
Minor REVISION comments	Paper language is very poor, it must be improved.	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The paper needs rigorous revisions to make it acceptable.	

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:	Raheel Muzzammel
Department, University & Country	University of Lahore, Pakistan