

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_84464
Title of the Manuscript:	Existence of positive solutions for the Kirchhoff type equations involving general critical growth in RN
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.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please discuss more on your results in conclusion part specially compare in detail your results with [27]. Please discuss clearly about how” Our results improve the previous results in the literature” briefly in abstract and in detail in conclusion part.	<p>Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. According to the changes requested by the reviewer, we have revised the manuscript carefully and the answers are as follows:</p> <p>Responds to the reviewer' comments:</p> <p>1. Please discuss more on your results in conclusion part specially compare in detail your results with [27].</p> <p><i>Response: We have discussed more on our results and compared in detail our results with [27] in conclusion part.</i></p> <p>2.Please discuss clearly about how” Our results improve the previous results in the literature” briefly in abstract and in detail in conclusion part.</p> <p><i>Response: We have discussed clearly about how” Our results improve the previous results in the literature” briefly in abstract and in detail in conclusion part.</i></p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This article is well written.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is comprehensive, and the manuscript is important for scientific community.	

Review Form 1.6

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>	There are not ethical issues in this manuscript.