

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_119991
Title of the Manuscript:	On propositions pertaining to the Riemann Hypothesis III
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Title: On propositions pertaining to the Riemann Hypothesis III This research gives an extended condition for Basu's papers [2022], Basu [2023a], and Basu [2023b]. I believe that this research is interesting. However, I have some problems with the sentences, language, formatting, and propositions. I think that the manuscript might need to be again rewritten before "resubmit for review".</p> <p>Suggestion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rephrase the title of this manuscript. 2. Write the difference between Riemann Hypothesis II and III, because of the same title of Basu. 3. An abstract is the beauty part of the paper. So, the abstract and main body are not relevant. 4. The introduction section is very weak. In this section, I think there might need to be definitions, objectives, statements of the problem, limitations, the literature review, and define of symbols. 5. Section two is very nice. But, there are so many errors in sentences, language, and grammatical. Define symbols and variables. Write the hypothesis, conditions, and proposition in Theorem format. E.g. Hypothesis 2.1 "Write the statement" Condition 2.1 "Write the statement" Proposition 2.1 "Write the statement" <i>Proof.</i> and so on. 6. Which part extended of Basu's paper is in the manuscript? Please mention. 7. Citations and references must be followed by the American Mathematical Society (AMS). 8. The conclusion is very weak. Write the summary of the main body of the manuscript. <p>I suggest that resubmitting this manuscript must include these suggestions. Thank you.</p>	
<p>MinorREVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bal B Tamang
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal