

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPAS_93852</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>On the Riemann Hypothesis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

**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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p align="center"><b>REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE "ON THE RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS"</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>This paper tries to give characterizations of the potential zeroes of the Riemann zeta function, which are stated in Proposition 1.2 and 1.3. To my best knowledge, I did not find serious mathematical mistakes except the following reference mistake, and I personally think this paper is of current interest and deserves publication in Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics, after revision.</p> <p align="center"><b>1. Errors</b></p> <p>(1) The references were not correct. The paper cited reference[2-4] in the second paragraph, however, no such references are listed at the end of paper.</p> <p>(2) The format of the second paragraph is weird, which goes beyond the extra space and is different from other paragraphs.</p> <p align="center"><b>2. Other suggestion</b></p> <p>(1) More references need to be cited to help audience clearly know other related work and how they are related to this work.</p> <p>(2) It would be better if the paper can give a little bit more explanatory background and references during the presentation as necessary. For example, whenever the author(s) mention the complex logarithm, the main branch should be specified, which can be subtle and easy to make mistake.</p> <p align="center"><b>3. Final remark</b></p> <p>I would consider this paper is sufficient for publication, provided that the main typos are fixed.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yulong Li</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nevada, USA</b>