



GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAM_1611
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of soft sets as soft semigroups
Type of the Article	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://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJPAM/editorial-policy>)

[GPH Review Form](#)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes.This manuscript motivates researchers. The study of this manuscript will help readers to do further research on it. Yes. The title is suitable for the article. Yes.The abstract is neatly written and it is comprehensive. It will be good, if the author includes the subsection METHODS AND MATERIALS . Yes. This is a new concept in semigroup theory which will attract anyone to work on it.It is scientifically correct. Yes All the references are sufficient .The authors used all references to do this work.	Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Language is suitable. Required some minor revision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	i) In all definitions, the defined term should be bold. ii) In Definition 2.4, do you mean soft subset ? Also in the last part $e \in$ which set ? (iii) In definitions 2.4 , 2.5 , 2.6 the author didn't specified about e . (iv) In Definition 2. 5, $H(e)$ should be replaced by $H(c)$. (v) Definitions 2.5 and Definition 2.9 are look same. Why do you give different names ? (VI) In Theorem 3.6 statement , replace two ideals by three ideals.	



GLOBAL PRESS HUB

[GPH Review Form](#)

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>	