

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_113272
Title of the Manuscript:	Edge-UltraFilter and Edge-Tangle for graph
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>No. Author can modify if interested like.... Novel idea on Edge-Ultrafilter and Edge-Tangle</p> <p>Abstract has to be rewritten in legible and comprehensible way. The objective of this manuscript is not stated properly. Author should realize abstract is the head of the paper which is the attracting zone of the researchers to make them read whole journal. It should contain the need and necessity of finding the concept.</p> <p>Author should modify the whole structure of the manuscript. Remove the unwanted paragraphs, repetitions and unnecessary words. eg: 1. Remove this paragraph - Definitions and Notations in this paper. 2. Numbering the paragraphs and theorems has to be changed.</p> <p>Yes. Okay.</p> <p>No. Author should delete the unwanted references used. Author can include maximum of 15 important references. References to be quoted as [1,2,3] to the maximum. Author must avoid connecting all together [1-45] in the abstract which is absurd.</p> <p>Author should explain the new concepts more clearly and avoid the already existing perceptions. Author should be careful in using lower and upper cases while writing the manuscript.</p> <p>Author should modify whole manuscript as the format is in irregular way. Author should concentrate in improving structure and continuity of the manuscript. The manuscript needs chronological order in framing and writing the concept like which one to be explained first, second, later and so on... which makes the reader interesting.</p> <p>Author can write and explain the theorem with adding cases, new definition used, Proof part separately, existing part separately Author should realize the importance in to elaborate the theorem which adds beauty of the manuscript.</p> <p>Author should write the conclusion, future idea, some open problems, some more results and discussions etc.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No. The quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Need to improve writing skills.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	B. Logeshwary
Department, University & Country	A.M Jain College, India