

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_115882
Title of the Manuscript:	Theorems of Coincidence Points and Fixed Points in Dualistic Partial Metric Space
Type of the Article	Original 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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript provides valuable contributions to the scientific community by introducing new fixed-point theorems, and common fixed-point theorems for various types of contractions in DPM spaces, extending existing results, and demonstrating their applicability through illustrative examples.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article effectively conveys the focus of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract comprehensively summarizes the main content and contributions of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, facilitating clear organization and readability.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript maintains scientific correctness.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications, maintaining clarity and precision in conveying mathematical concepts and results.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Consider maintaining consistency in interval notation throughout the manuscript to enhance clarity. Specifically, I recommend using either closed intervals with square brackets (e.g., [0, 1]) or half-open intervals consistently (e.g., [0, 1) or [0, 1]), ensuring uniformity in notation.</p> <p>It seems there are some sets mentioned on page 4 that haven't been defined yet. It's essential to provide a clear definition of all sets introduced in the manuscript before their utilization to ensure coherence and understanding for the reader</p> <p>In the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is suggested that in line 3, the statement 'Suppose that $\theta_{i+1} \neq \theta_i$...' should be replaced with '$\theta_i \neq \theta_{i-1}$' to ensure that θ_0 does not inadvertently equal θ_1.</p> <p>In several instances, the text refers to a point $\omega \in (\mathcal{C}, \tau^*)$, suggesting it should instead specify a point within a set, as in $\omega \in \mathcal{C}$. This clarification ensures consistency in the notation and accurately reflects the intended meaning.</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:	Woraphak Nithiarayaphaks
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand