



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_33396
Title of the Manuscript:	Viscosity Approximation Methods in Reflexive Banach Spaces
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:

(<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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In section 2, there is no need to write proofs of lemmas. Because they are in literature. There is no relation between Abstract and Introduction. Also, Introduction must be designed more well.	It is obviously true that some of the lemmas already exist in literature; but their proofs may not exist or their proofs may be entirely different from our style of proof. Lemmas and their proofs are indispensable in achieving a particular purpose. Reviewer's comments have been incorporated and the proofs of Lemmas 2.5, 2.7 and 2.8 have been removed. Those retained are inherently linked with our main results. The missing link between the Abstract and the Introduction has been bridged.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In generally, manuscript well designed, sententious and apprehensible. In section 3, proofs of theorems are looking true and interesting. Manuscript is well equipped with Banach spaces i.e. Functional Analysis. References are enough for this study.	Comments are in order and support our results.