

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Mathematics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJOM_121671</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>On the number of combinations generating a sum</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 article in question focuses on reproducing previous results using a different method as well as proving some corollaries. This kind of research has its place in the community. It helps reestablish and consolidate the underlying concepts. I liked this article because it is concise and to the point. However, in keeping the article concise, the authors have not been able to be comprehensive enough.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title has simplicity and clarity.	
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.	The abstract could use an addition. Specifically, in two parts: 1. the method used 2. the primary result	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article has the typical Introduction-Body structure. But it lacks the concluding section. I would advise the authors to add a short conclusion at the very end of the article.	
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.	The article uses/pre-supposes some fundamental results, such as Szemerédi's theorem and works of Erdos, Hardy et al. The primary method is logical argumentation, which at the very least can be grounded in reason and fundamental mathematics. The article follows the standard structure of mathematical proof. All the lines of argumentation are correct and I have no reason to believe that the authors are wrong at any point of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes. The references are sufficient and fairly recent.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language/English quality is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aryan Phadke</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Phadke Academy, India</b>