



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_49643
Title of the Manuscript:	Proof of Collatz conjecture
Type of the Article	Original research

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introductory and methodology part of the abstract looks good. But author(s) have not incorporated a conclusion of the abstract. Author(s) should give a conclusion of their comparison. 2. Author(s) should cite the properties used in section 2.3 and section 2.4 (From which source?) 3. In section 2.8.4, author(s) made reference to Collatz algorithm but has not cited the source. 4. Author(s) have not made any reference of the source of section 3 and section 4. This is not allowed. Sources of those information should be cited. 5. Author(s) should incorporate their concluding remarks into abstract. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion has been included in the abstract. 2. Section 2.3 comes directly from Gauss fundamental theorem of arithmetic. Section 2.4 comes from section 2.3 3. Collatz algorithm is now explicated in the introduction. 4. Section 3 and 4 are entirely deduced from precedent ones. If such references are required, please tell me, I will be glad to include them. 5. See 1.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, there exist novelty in the work. 2. Author(s) have demonstrated a good understanding of the concept and incorporated all the theorems necessary for the illustrations. 3. The objective of the study has been achieved and it's in line with the concluding remarks. 4. Overall, the analysis and comparison looks good. <p>REVIEWER'S DECISION</p> <p>I suggest that the manuscript should be accepted for publication subject to the above-mentioned minor suggestions. Accept if all suggestions have been incorporated.</p>	Thank you.



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>	No.