

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_97375
Title of the Manuscript:	Some consequences of Bertrand's extended postulate
Type of the Article	Minireview 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>)

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 my opinion, does not clearly state what objectives are to be achieved, nor does it even explain whether such objectives have been achieved. In general, it seems to be a collection of isolated results that are being presented without a clear relationship between them. 2. I couldn't find any reference to "Bertrand's extended postulate". Maybe "Bertrand's Postulate Extension" is better. 3. The abstract is a copy of the abstract of reference [2]. 4. The structure of the article is chaotic. There is an "intro", which actually represents the entire article. There are 11 sections in this intro, some titled, some untitled, and even mistitled. There is nothing like the desirable Introduction-Development-Conclusion structure. Extremely confusing. 5. I was unable to come to conclusions about what the article proposes. Perhaps, if it were rewritten in better form, perhaps its aims and conclusions would become clearer. 6. There are 13 references. Five of them are from wikipedia (where, in general, there is no peer review), and therefore it is difficult to trust the veracity of the results presented there.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although there is little text in the article, the English presented is correct.	
Optional/General comments	I strongly suggest that the paper be rewritten, with better structure, clearer objectives and more robust references.	

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:	Leonardo Simal Moreira
Department, University & Country	UniFOA, Centro Universitário de Volta Redonda, Brazil