



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this paper, the author(s) are promised to give some new generalizations of the results by Beg et al. (2010) (see [10]). They claimed their results are true under some assumption without the normality of induced cones. There is only ONE main result, which is Theorem 3.1. The others are only a simple and immediate corollaries. Looking at Theorem 3.1, I have found a slip in the proof at the equation (3.8). In fact, this equation cannot be deducted from the earlier equations (remember that a supremum is not distributive under divisions). This implies that this paper is not scientifically correct. However, I still think that this mistake can be corrected by changing the assumptions of the theorem.	I would like to thank this reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions, and our response is below. I would like to assure that there is no slip in the proof at the equation (3.8). We definitely did not distribute the supremum under division. Maybe the written text is confusing a bit and did not help in explaining what we are doing in a proper way, therefore, we modify the text in the revised version using yellow text so that it becomes more appropriate to show what we mean in a more proper way.
Minor REVISION comments	I believe that the author(s) would be willing to give some more main results (one or two) that are NOT immediate consequences, to make the paper stands at a higher qualification. Please make me see some more interesting theorems or examples.	Thank you for the suggestion, but we believe that the paper has adequate number of results to appear in one paper.
Optional/General comments	I think the proofs in the paper are way too long and some part could positively be omitted. Moreover, you have to be very careful on results in cone metric spaces and G-metric spaces. In many cases, they are equivalent to the ordinary metric spaces. For some information, please take a look at the following papers and if necessary, cite them: 1. M. Jleli and B. Samet (2012) http://www.fixedpointtheoryandapplications.com/content/2012/1/210 2. P. Chaipunya and P. Kumam (2013) http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jfsa/aip/194631/	Thank you for the suggestion, but we would prefer to keep them as they are in order to have them easier to follow. Besides, another reviewer has already asked for doing some omitted parts of technical calculations from the proofs.