

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_96047
Title of the Manuscript:	On propositions pertaining to the Riemann Hypothesis
Type of the Article	Short 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.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 	<p>corrections as follows:</p> <p>The Abstract has to be rewritten from scratch Also in: 2 Riemann Hypothesis The first line must be disappeared and in the other text before every mathematical type it has to mentioned all the elements of type analytical. After :2 Riemann Hypothesis must be a chapter with title: Results and after a chapter with title conclusion</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Fix language errors	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mazaris Alkis
Department, University & Country	University of Zurich, Switzerland