



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_5773
Title of the Manuscript:	Generalized n-Tupled Common Fixed Point Theorems for Contractive Rational Type Condition
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments

1. Definition 1.2 is not correctly written.
2. Page 374 line 1, the inequality is actually an equality.
3. Page 374, line 4, this inequality is not clear, in particular the inequality involving the term $\alpha \psi(d(x_{n-1}, x_n))$.
4. Page 375, line 3, the inequality is actually an equality.
5. Page 375, line -1, appears $\beta, \gamma \in (0, 1)$. This condition is not enough to conclude. The conclusion holds with the condition: $\beta + \gamma < 1$.
6. Page 377, lines 22 and 24 the inequalities are in fact equalities.
7. Page 377, line 24, why $\max\{d(Sx_n, x_{n-1}), d(Sx_n, Sx_{n-1})\} = d(x_{n+1}, x_{n-1})$?, the sequence (x_n) is not ordered.
8. Page 378, line 6, at the final appears mn, it should be deleted.
9. Page 378, line 20, the inequality is actually an equality.
10. Page 39, line 4, the inequality is actually an equality.

These page numbers and definition numbers are not in our text. It seems that these are not related to our paper. Hence we disagree with these comments.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are lack of punctuation in the whole manuscript, also a series of misprints.	We have rechecked our paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Col 2.1.a, Col 2.1.b, Col 2.2.a and Col 2.2.b should be replace for Corollary 2.1.a...so on.	These are not in our paper