

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_122600
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF ODD PAIRS OF PARTITIONS OF AN EVEN NUMBER OF A NEW FORMULATION IN VALIDATING THE TWIN PRIME CONJECTURE
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
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 author introduced a way to the partitioning of even numbers into pairs of odd numbers. The title is broad Previous studies are few in the introduction, and they do not include confirmed results except for examples.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better to be Examples on a new approach of the Twin Prime Conjecture.	
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.	Yes, mostly	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need some modifications	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Insufficient references, see https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/18-104-seminar-in-analysis-applications-to-number-theory-fall-2006/ba06bc66574b1ea6affcaec23ef5c33b_berke.pdf https://www.utqiu.ro/math/sma/v12/p12_17.pdf Is [1] published?	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Salwa Salman Abed
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq