Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_99653**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The set of rationale numbers is countably infinite - a simple proof**
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.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. This study presents a simple proof of the well-known fact that the set of rational numbers is countable. The authors have found an injective mapping from Q into Z. Although the proven result is widely known and has many simple proofs, an elegant proof is given using a different coding technique. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes **5.** In the construction of the function, it is essential that the numerator and denominator of the rational number have no common divisor larger than 1. Because it depends on the function to be well defined. However, this was not taken into account in Examples 1 and 2. **6. Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. Yes, but using "rational" instead of "rationale" used in the article would be more appropriate for English.	
Optional/General comments	Considering the points I have emphasized above, I think it is appropriate to print it if necessary arrangements are made.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tuncay Tunç**
Department, University & Country	**Mersin University, Türkiye**