

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_104168
Title of the Manuscript:	LOWER AND UPPER BOUNDS OF A JUMP GRAPH USING TOPOLOGICAL INDICES
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:

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

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript does not show significance to scientific community. It lacks of discussions on how this research could provide meaningful and importance to other researchers.</p> <p>2. No comment</p> <p>3. Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract, seems very short and it should have word limit up to 250. Precisely state the design, sample, input, and results. Abstract should justify the methodologies through the development of the research. Consider the statements of the results describes in your paper, the implications and the significance of the study. If the abstract has a reference, it is advised to cite and address it in APA style adequately. Consider appropriate keywords and it also found in the context of the abstract. And, keywords should have at least 5 terminologies. <p>4. Subsections and structures of the manuscript is inappropriate, it is confusing, since also there are no full descriptions or discussion for every sections.</p> <p>5. It may consider scientifically correct but, there is a lack of definitions and manuscript structure should improve.</p> <p>6. It could be better to have additional and appropriate references.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References should also in order/alphabetical. Follow references standard and guidelines in the publication. Observe and apply the APA format regulations in its latest version. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is no or just a small of English to read in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose P. Ching
Department, University & Country	University of Eastern Philippines, Philippines