

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_90139
Title of the Manuscript:	Internal Set Theory IST#based on hyper infinitary logic with Restricted Modus Ponens Rule.
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:

(<https://www.journaljamcs.com/index.php/JAMCS/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The incompleteness of set theory leads one to look for natural extensions of in which one can prove statements independent of which appear to be "true". One approach has been to add large cardinal axioms. Or, one can investigate second-order expansions like Kelley-Morse class theory, or Tarski Grothendieck set theory.</p> <p>It is a non-conservative extension of and is obtained from other axiomatic set theories by the inclusion of Tarski's axiom which implies the existence of inaccessible cardinals.</p> <p>In this paper, it has been looked at a set theory , based on bivalent gyper infinitary logic with restricted Modus Ponens Rule, and dealing with the set theory based on gyper infinitary logic with Restricted Modus Ponens Rule [Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science, 36(2) (2021), 73-88], [Journal of Advances in Mathemacs and Computer Science, 36(8) (2021), 70-119] and [Journal of Advances in Mathemacs and Computer Science, 36(4) (2021), 90-112].</p> <p>Neoconservative extensions of the canonical internal set theories IST and HST are proposed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main motivation and contribution should be highlighted at the end of the Introduction. 2. At the end of Appendixes, which theorems correspond to which conclusions need to be clearly stated?. 3. The references department does not contain the references [27], [32], [33] and [34] which are indicated in the text (Just contains 13 references). 4. The Conclusion should be added at the end of the article. 5. There are a lot of printing mistakes in the text and should be corrects 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sobhy El-sayed Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Benha University, Egypt