

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_88638
Title of the Manuscript:	Calculus of orthogonal projectors
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Abstract and Conclusion part are written very poorly. Improve these three parts.</li><li>ii) Improve the introduction part by giving the literature review of your work and cite the references accordingly.</li><li>iii) In proposition 1, there are five statements. But you didn't prove statement (v) is equivalent to other statements.</li><li>iv) You have not cited reference 1 and 2.</li><li>v) Cite all references in the appropriate places of your article.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) The abstract and the conclusion have been clearly rewritten.</li><li>ii) The introduction part has been redone while giving the literature review of our work.</li><li>iii) Statement (v) has been captured in the last part of the proof Similarly <math>(i) \Rightarrow (v) \Rightarrow (i)</math></li><li>iv) References 1 and 2 have been cited in the introduction section of the paper.</li><li>v) All the references have been cited appropriately in the article.</li></ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Cite some recent papers related to this work.</li></ul>	Recent papers of 2015 have been captured.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript.