

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. The importance of this manuscript is questionable. The game of chess, firstly, is very difficult, and secondly, it is quite well studied. Those simplifications that are made for the game, of course, have the right to exist, but the goal that the author sets himself is unclear. 2. The name is fully consistent with the work. Is it just to note that a simplified version of the game of chess is being considered. 3. The abstract fully describes the tasks set in the article. 4. The structure of the work is clear. 5. The correctness of a manuscript in mathematics and its applications is determined by the proof of the stated statements or the construction of algorithms that solve a particular problem. In this work, the proofs do not look like mathematical ones. The proposed program may solve a certain problem, but the correctness of the program itself is not checked. There are methods for checking the correctness and verification of programs, but they were not used, because there are no references to them. In addition, the program code should be provided with comments that help the outside reader, in particular the reviewer, understand what the program does and how. 6. Links are clearly not enough. This is due to the fact that the author does not clearly set the task and does not define the purpose of his work.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I think that the author should describe the problem he is solving in a grid. Explain what is the meaning (reason) of simplifying the game. Explain how the results were obtained. you should also check the correctness of the program, for example, by means of Hoare's logic.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yuri Nikitich Lovyagin
Department, University & Country	Saint Peterburg University, Russia