

Review of: "Results in Cone Metric Spaces and Related Fixed Point Theorems for Contractive Type Mappings"

Sanjib Kumar Datta¹

¹ University of Kalyani

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review Report

Article Title: Results in cone metric spaces and related fixed point theorems for contractive type mappings

Authors: Muhammed Raji¹ and Musa Adeku Ibrahim²

Recommendation to Editor: **Resubmit for review, revisions required.**

After going through the paper, the quality of the paper may be graded as follows:

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| i. Contribution to existing knowledge | : <u>Sufficiently good,</u> |
| ii. Organization and readability | : <u>Up to the mark,</u> |
| iii. Soundness of methodology | : <u>Good,</u> |
| iv. Evidence supports conclusion | : <u>Fine,</u> |

And

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| i. Adequacy of literature review | : <u>Moderately good.</u> |
|---|----------------------------------|

Strengths:

- i. The results proved in the paper are methodically correct supported by suitable examples,
- ii. The applications of the results have properly been incorporated here and also 'Conclusion' part is there.
- iii. The authors have clearly and nicely mentioned in their paper- 'Data availability', 'Authors contributions', 'Compliance with ethical standards', 'Conflicting interests' & 'Research involving human participants and/or animals'.
- iv. At the end of the paper, it contains an insightful reference list.

Weaknesses:

- i. No counter example(s) is(are) seen in the paper to justify the validity of the results proved. The authors should justify whether the conclusions of their results are sharper estimations over the results of others and also whether the conditions employed there are essential or not.
- ii. Open problems generated from the results proved and also the future course of work as a consequence of those should be neatly sketched before the 'References' section.

iii. The reference list should be in a conventional and uniform mode.

Suggestion(s) to the author:

The author should take into account the weaknesses as mentioned above and revise the paper accordingly.

Therefore, in my opinion, the paper may be accepted in the journal after resubmission implementing proper modifications and incorporation of the comments made above.