

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126420
Title of the Manuscript:	On Dual Hyperbolic Generalized Woodall Numbers
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The main goal of the work is to define the dual hyperbolic generalized Woodall numbers (see eq. 2.1, p. 6) and given some properties of them. The reader can see how they are obtained the generating functions (see Theorem 3, p. 10) and Binet's formulas (see Theorem 2, p. 9) for them. In section 3, there some identities for dual hyperbolic generalized Woodall numbers. In short the authors present several properties of dual hyperbolic generalized Woodall numbers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Acceptable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Suitable. However, the introduction can be made more attractive.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In the introduction, authors should outline their main results. The calculations are correct. The motivation of the topic should be made more attractive to the reader.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable.	
Optional/General comments	I recommend putting conclusions where the technique used is highlighted. Ask the authors, there are Diophantine equations associated with the numbers studied here.	

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:	Fausto Jarquin Zarate
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México