

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Mathematics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJOM_96389 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A variant of chess with an upper bound for the number of reachable positions obtained from various initial configurations of pieces |
| 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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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) |
|---|---|---|
| Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1- In its current form, the manuscript does not present sufficiently relevant contributions to the scientific community. 2- Yes! 3- The abstract superficially presents the contribution of the manuscript, and part of the text of the abstract the authors repeat in the introduction. 4- Yes! 5- Yes! 6- The manuscript only has 2 references, insufficient quantity for a scientific manuscript. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| 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: | Angelo Marcelo Tuset |
| Department, University & Country | Federal University of Technology, Brazil |