



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMCS_6840
Title of the Manuscript:	SOME NEW RESULTS AND GENERALIZATIONS IN G-CONE METRIC FIXED POINT THEORY
Type of the 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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This is good paper in the field of fixed point theory, even the authors try to proof their results when cone is arbitrary (non-normal cone). My comments: Minor error need to be correct: (i): Page 5, L17, why $G(x_n; Tu; Tu) = G(u; Tu; Tu)$? (ii): It seems that the authors at first remove coefficient 2 of $G(y; Ty; Ty)$ and $G(y; y; Ty)$ in the condition (3.1); and then, does not need to bring Remark 3.2. So in this case the Corollaries of 3.1 and 3.2 should be review. (iii): The Example 3.1, is almost clear, it is better when the authors consider non-normal cone, like as $E := C_1 R([0; 1])$ with $\ k\ := \ k\ _1 + \ k\ _0$ and non-normal cone $P = \{f \in E : f(t) \geq 0; t \in [0; 1]\}$.	I would like to thank this reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions. <u>Response to minor comments:</u> (i) This is true using eq. (3.7) and the properties of G. (ii) Thank you for your suggestion. Though, we would like to keep the coefficient 2 of $G(y; Ty; Ty)$ and $G(y; y; Ty)$ in the condition (3.1); since, apparently, the point of having the coefficient 2 of $G(y; Ty; Ty)$ and $G(y; y; Ty)$ in the condition (3.1) is actually to make the proof of the more general result which is Theorem 3.2 (in the initial version) and is now Theorem 3.5 (in the revised version) be a straightforward from the proof of Theorem 3.1. Therefore, we added remarks to illustrate that we still can remove the coefficient 2 of $G(y; Ty; Ty)$ and $G(y; y; Ty)$ in the condition (3.1) and have positive results. (iii) the aim of this simple example is to illustrate the new concepts and the new results in an easy-understandable way which is achieved in our opinion. <u>Typos:</u>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Some of typon error in text: Page 3, L10 :::); 8x; y; z 2 X should be:::);for each x; y; z 2 X: Page 4, L18 numbers 5 and 4 should be 1 and 2, resp.	Page 3, L10: thanks for this note. This has been modified. Page 4, L18 : I did the calculations again and the numbers 5 and 4 are definitely true. To show this, we consider from (3.3) the quantity $G(x_n; x_n; x_{n+1}) + G(x_{n-1}; x_{n-1}; x_{n+1})$ and using eq. (3.4) we get $G(x_n; x_n; x_{n+1}) + G(x_{n-1}; x_{n-1}; x_{n+1})$ $< = G(x_{n-1}; x_{n-1}; x_{n+1}) + G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n) + G(x_{n-1}; x_{n-1}; x_{n+1})$ $< = 2[2G(x_{n-1}; x_{n+1}; x_{n+1})] + G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n)$ $< = 4G(x_{n-1}; x_{n-1}; x_{n+1}) + G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n)$ $< = 4[G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n) + G(x_n; x_{n+1}; x_{n+1})] + G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n)$ $< = 5G(x_{n-1}; x_n; x_n) + 4 G(x_n; x_{n+1}; x_{n+1})$ Page4, L19: I did the calculations again in a similar way as explained above and the number 8 is definitely true.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		